

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 26th November 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at half-past ten of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

I.—SWEARING-IN OF A NEW MEMBER.

Sri Vyricherla Chandra Chudamani Deo was sworn-in.

II.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Report of the Khosla Committee.

* 142 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the report of the Technical Committee of the Planning Commission on the Krishna and Godavari River Valley Schemes has been received by the Government; and

(b) if so, whether 3 copy of the same will be placed on the table of the House?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“(a) & (b) The Planning Commission have forwarded to this Government the tentative interim report of the Technical Committee received by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission inform us that they are arranging for further investigations and have banned publication of the interim communication. When a communication is received by this Government and made available for publication, it will certainly be placed on the table of the House.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“May I know when this report was communicated to this Government and whether the Technical Committee which made the report called it tentative?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“The Technical Committee did not send us any report. The Planning Commission sent it to us with a demi-official letter stating that this so-called report was being sent for further examination. It was marked confidential.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“May I know, while perusing the report which was sent along with the demi-official letter, whether the Government noted anywhere that the Technical Committee called it an interim report or a tentative report?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“I might mention to the hon. Member that I have not yet seen the report. It was a letter from the Planning Commission which was dealt with by the Government. The matter itself was and

[26th November 1952]

is still being dealt with by the technical officers of this Government. It is going on and it will be a subject for further discussion there. Any questions about the title given to the paper must be addressed to the Planning Commission."

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—"ఇప్పుడు గవర్నమెంటు వారికి వచ్చినటువంటి యీ రిపోర్టు interim technical committee report అని చెప్పుతున్నారు. అసలు ఇది మొదటనే interim report గా వచ్చిందా, లేక గుర్తాను గవర్నమెంటు ఆ విధంగాచేయాలని Planning Commission వారిని కోరిన తరువాత అలా వచ్చిందా ? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"It is no good spinning it out. I have made the matter perfectly clear. The Planning Commission are still considering this communication that they received from the Technical Committee of theirs. They may give it out for opinion to all and sundry but it is not yet in the possession of this Government."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—"ఈ కమిటీ రిపోర్టు వచ్చిందని రంగా రెడ్డిగారు, రాలేదని ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు చెప్పుతున్నారు. అది వచ్చివుంటే ఇక్కడ cabinet సభ్యులు దానిని పరిశీలించి తమ అభిప్రాయాలను Central Governmentకు పంపించారా? రాకపోయినట్లయితే దానిని తెప్పించేందుకు కృషిచేసి మా అందరికీ కూడా దానికాపీలు సత్తులు చేస్తారా ? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"It is still under technical examination by technical people. I want the hon. Member to take my word for it. I have not yet seen the report. I have not looked at even the first page of this paper."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"May I know whether the Hon. the Minister for Public Works, who is in charge of the subject, has seen the report, touched the report or at least read the title page of the report? I want to know whether he has physically seen the report."

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—"I may tell the hon. Member that I have seen the report."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"May I know then, whether the Technical Committee called it a tentative or an interim report and that, therefore, it should not be published? May I also know the date on which this Government received the report? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Any questions with reference to the contents of the paper are covered by our previous answer made on behalf of the Government that the report is still declared to be a confidential paper by the Planning Commission who have sent it to us, and it is not right for us to give out in bits any particular parts of it for publication. It will lead more to misunderstanding than to understanding."

26th November 1952]

Report of the Khosla Committee.

* 143 Q.—SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Madras State Government have received a copy of the report either provisional or final of the Technical Committee of the Planning Commission headed by Khosla; and

(b) if so, whether it or a summary of its contents will be placed on the table?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“The question is the same as the previous one. I have already answered it.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“Sir, I am not asking for parts of the reports to be given out. I am asking whether the report was declared by the Technical Committee to be a tentative or an interim one, whether the Hon. the Public Works Minister will be able to say whether he has seen the title page at least, if he has not studied the report, and whether he can give us also the date of receipt of the report. I have asked this question three times. I want to know when this Government received the report.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“All that is part of the same matter. It is a confidential paper, the date, signature, name, title, matter, paragraphs, marginal notes, all included.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—“May I know whether this Government have given any opinion on that interim or tentative report?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“No, Sir.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“I am asking whether the Hon. the Minister for Public Works has seen the report in newspapers of the proceedings in Parliament where the Central Minister in charge of the subject stated that the report was forwarded to this Government in September. May I know whether the Hon. the Minister for Public Works will be able to say on what date the report was received here? It is not part of what the Chief Minister has already stated.” 10-40 a.m.

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“With the permission of the Hon. the Minister for Public Works, I wish to say that we cannot go by newspaper reports of what answer was given and what exactly the hon. Member who put the question meant, when he spoke of the ‘report.’ What the Hon. the Minister for Public Works gave as answer just now may be remembered. He said, ‘I have seen the report.’ He meant the paper called so by the questioner. There is nothing more which we can draw from it, and I do not think that we can answer questions relating to newspaper reports.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“In view of the fact that this report concerns projects affecting the lives of hundreds of thousands of people in this State, will the Government consider it

[26th November 1952]

desirable to write to the Planning Commission to see that the public of this State are taken into confidence with regard to the report and to publish the report immediately for discussion?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Apart from the number of lives involved and the guardians thereof, I wish to inform the hon. Member that I have already enquired of the Planning Commission whether they would allow us to publish it and place it on the table of the House, but they replied that it should be still kept confidential. If hon. Members do not agree with that decision, they are entitled to move their comrades and friends in Parliament to ask the Planning Commission to take necessary action." (Cheers.)

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"ఒక రిపోర్టు వచ్చిందని ముందు చెప్పి, తరువాత అది రిపోర్టు కాదని చెప్పుతున్నారు. అంటే ఆ వచ్చినట్లుంటే కాగితాలను వదులవడం దానే వాటిని వెనుకకు పంపించడం ఈ ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క పాలిసీయూ, లేక వచ్చిన కాగితాలను చదివి అంటే దానిమీద తన అభిప్రాయాలను చెప్పకుండానే పంపించడం వారిపద్ధతీయూ లేకపోలే వచ్చినదాన్ని దాచిపెట్టి, ఏమీ జరిగిందో ప్రజలకు తెలుపక ప్రజలలో కలతలు రేకెత్తించడమే వారి ఉద్దేశ్యమూ అని అడుగుతున్నాను."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Nagi Reddi is conversant with democratic practice in general. But he does not seem to know what is necessary to be done in this particular case which involves technical examination. When any paper is received, which is called a technical paper or a paper on technical subjects calling for opinion, it must first be seen by the technical people here. There is no question of the insinuation that was made being at all correct, namely, that the policy of this Government is to return papers without studying them."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I shall allow only one more question."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I submit to you, Sir, that this is a very important matter? It is because it is important, I requested you yesterday to have it taken up at the beginning to-day so that we might have some time."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The matter is confidential. What is going on now is mere cross-examination and not questions put for eliciting information."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I make a submission to the Chair? I have strictly followed the Hon. the Chief Minister when he said that the report was confidential and that, therefore, he was unable to give information. I am not pursuing that point. I am only asking for the date on which this Government received the report. How can that be confidential?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Please do not shout. This is fast approaching the third degree method."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I ask the Hon. the Chief Minister, who has intervened now, whether he is aware that the

26th November 1952]

Hon. the Minister for Public Works said on October 21—although he originally had denied the fact—that he did receive the report? I am not asking any particular question of a confidential nature. Did the Planning Commission tell this Government that the date on which this Government received the report also should be treated as confidential? I want to know the date; the public are anxious to know something about all this. There is no use of side-tracking the issue when the Central Government said that they had sent the report."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"There is no question of side-tracking on our part. When a paper is marked confidential, all matters relating to it must be treated as confidential. I have already said, if hon. Members are very particular as to the date when it was received or it was posted, even that question should be referred to the Minister in charge at Delhi and not here."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"In view of the fact that the Minister has said that the report was forwarded in September, what is the objection of this Government to giving the date of its actual receipt here? Is the date of receipt also confidential?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I am bound by the direction given to me along with the posting of the paper. I am bound to do in courtesy as well as in administrative propriety what I have been asked by them to do. If the hon. Member has got an answer from the Minister in Delhi, he should be satisfied with that."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"ఈ ప్రశ్న పేసిన నాకు అవకాశము ఇవ్వలేదంటే."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have allowed enough time for this question. I cannot allow every hon. Member to put supplementary questions in a House where we have 375 Members."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"On a point of order, Sir, నేను ప్రశ్న చేస్తే, నాకే అవకాశమివ్వకుండా ఉండడం అన్యాయమంటే."

MR. SPEAKER:—"No point of order now. Next question."

Minimum wages for agricultural labourers.

* 148 Q.—SRI P. SYAMASUNDARA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are considering the question of fixing minimum wages to agricultural labourers; and

(b) if so, the present stage of the matter?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—" (a) Yes, Sir.

" (b) A special enquiry was conducted in the low wage areas of the State. The results of the enquiry are under examination. Orders will be issued after the examination is over."

[26th November 1952]

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ How long will it take to examine these proposals? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ We have referred the matter to the Economic Adviser who has given his tentative report. It is being examined by the Board of Revenue, the Commissioner of Labour and the Director of Agriculture. It will be published as a notification for public criticism. I do not think it will take long. If the hon. Member will have some patience, it will not take more than six months.”

10-50
a.m.

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—“ నాట్లు వేసింది మొదలు మరల కోతలు కోసే వరకు కూలీలకు పనులు దొరకక unemployment సమస్య ఎక్కువ అవుతుంది. దీనికి తక్కువ కూలీ అధిక ఫరలు తోడ్పడిస్తాయి. కనుక ఇప్పుడేనా ప్రభుత్వము కూలీలకు కనీస వేతనాల గురించి ఒక బిల్లు ప్రవేశపెట్టునుందా? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ The Hon. Member may put a separate question.”

SRI M. VEERABHADRAM :—“ గవర్నమెంట్ అగ్రికల్చర్ ఫారములూ పనిచేసేవారుంటి కూలీల విషయాన్ని కూడా పరిశీలనకు తీసుకుంటారా? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ I think, Sir, that category of employees are also under consideration.”

SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM :—“ May I know whether they will take into consideration the Mayuram agreement and such other things included in the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaial Protection Bill in fixing the agricultural minimum wages.”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Notice, Sir.”

SRI G. ANJANEYULU :—“ ఈ కూలీల రేటును నిర్ణయించడానికి ఇంకా ఎంత కాలము అవుతుంది. ఇదివరలో దీనినిగురించి ఒక కమిటీకూడా వేశారు. ఈ కమిటీ ఏమి నిర్ణయించింది? ఈ wages నిర్ణయించుచేయడానికి ఎంత కాలమవుతుందో మంత్రిగారు నెలవివ్వగలరా? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Sir, I have just answered this question. The matter is being examined by the Board of Revenue, the Commissioner of Labour and the Director of Agriculture. After this is done, it will be published for eliciting public opinion. I said, all this may not take more than six months. It may be done even earlier. I will try my best to bring it out earlier.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఈ విషయములూ Labour Commissioner మొదలైనటువంటి ఉద్యోగస్తులు విచారణచేసిన తరువాత నిర్ణయ ప్రజలకు అందజేస్తామని చెప్పి, తరువాత ప్రజలకు అందజేసేందుకు ఎక్కువ రైతులు అవుతుందని చెప్పేదానికంటే ఈ Labour Commissioner మొదలైనటువంటి ఉద్యోగస్తులు పరిశీలించేయకుండానే దానిని వెంటనే ప్రజలకు అందజేసేస్తుంటే ప్రజాస్వామ్యాలను తెలుసుకొనడానికి వీలుండుందికదా అని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

26th November 1952]

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ I might tell my hon. Friend that the Planning Commission has given me time till December 1953 to produce the report. I shall try to bring it out much earlier than the scheduled time.”

(Sri P. Syamasundara Rao stood up.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The House should realize my difficulties I have already received a large number of answers. More answers are pouring in from the Departments. I am placing about 24 questions each day before the House. Therefore it is not possible to allow all hon. Members to put supplementaries.”

SRI P. SYAMASUNDARA RAO :—“ ప్రశ్న వేసినది నేను. శ్యామసుందర రావును నేనేకాని నాకింతవరకు ఉపప్రశ్న వేసేందుకు chance ఇవ్వలేదు.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ The hon. Member says that he put the main question and that he was not allowed to put supplementaries.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ If he is sitting quiet, how is it possible for me to call him? He must get up in his seat.”

Memorandum submitted to the Hon. the Prime Minister of India.

* 155 Q.—**SRI A. RAMASAMY THEVAR** (on behalf of Sri K. T. Kosalram): Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government presented any memorandum to the Hon. the Prime Minister of India;

(b) if so, whether the Government will place a copy of it on the table of the House;

(c) whether the memorandum was pressed by the representatives of this Government in the recent Finance Ministers' Conference at New Delhi; and

(d) if so, what is the outcome?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ (a) Yes, Sir.

“ (b) The subject is still under correspondence with the Government of India. The Government do not consider it proper to publish such correspondence.

“ (c) & (d) The question as far as it was relevant and in the form in which it could with propriety be brought to notice at the Conference was so brought to notice.

“ The Government of India accepted the principle of taking into consideration the question of providing in the National Plan for unforeseen expenditure on natural calamities and other similar contingencies arising in any part of India.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ బ్రిటన్ మొమ్మరాండం ప్రభుత్వము ఇచ్చారా అని ఇందులో ప్రశ్న వేశారు. ప్రభుత్వము ఎన్నో మొమ్మరాండములు ఇచ్చివుంటుంది.

[26th November 1952]

లుంది. కను యీ ప్రశ్న ఏ మొమురాండమునకు సంబంధించినటువంటిదో మరియు మరొకగా చెప్పినటువంటి జవాబు ఏ మొమురాండమునకు సంబంధించినటువంటిదో నెలవిస్తారా? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ The Prime Minister was here only once and I gave him only one memorandum at the time and that is why I have said ‘ Yes ’ in answer to the question.”

Location of a Sub-Magistrate's Court in Punganur.

* 156 Q.—**SRI B. KRISHNAMURTHY RAO:** Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state why the Government have not thought it fit to locate a Sub-Magistrate's Court in Punganur?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—“ It was considered that the volume of work arising in and around Punganur did not justify the stationing of a full-time Sub-Magistrate at that place. Prior to the introduction of the scheme of separation in Chittoor district, the Deputy Tahsildar of Punganur was exercising magisterial functions which was terminated when separation was ordered. The jurisdiction over Punganur taluk has been conveniently divided between the Stationary Sub-Magistrates at Madanapalle and Piler each of them exercising jurisdiction over the adjoining area of Punganur taluk.”

SRI K. VARADACHARI:—“ May I ask, Sir, whether the Government have noted the fact that Piler where the present Magistrate's Court is situated is nearly 70 miles from Punganur and that people find it difficult to cover such long distances? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—“ Sir, the Government considered the question in 1950. The Committee was also asked to examine it. It was found that the present arrangement was the most suitable to the litigant public.”

SRI V. CHIDANANDAM:—“ Is it not necessary, Sir, irrespective of the distance and the number of cases tried, that a Sub-Magistrate's Court should be there for each taluk? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—“ It will be only waste of time if such a rule were to be adopted.”

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI:—“ May I bring it to the notice of the Government, as my hon. Friend just now said, that some people have to travel for three days to go to the Piler Sub-Magistrate's Court? The Hon. Minister just now said that the Committee recommended that the present arrangement was adequate. Whatever the recommendations of the Committee may be, I request the Government to open a court at Punganur and thus remove the difficulty experienced by the people? ”

26th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—"Sir, so far as the Government are concerned, they have another difficulty. It is the High Court which has to locate the Sub-Magistrates' Courts, and they have held that the present court is more suitable to the litigant public."

Thefts in the Legislators' Hostel.

* 157 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) how many thefts committed in the Legislators' Hostel were reported at the D-2 Police Station (Wallajah Road) within the last one year;

(b) what is the amount of property involved; and

(c) what action has so far been taken?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" (a), (b) & (c) Six cases of thefts were reported at D-1 Triplicane Police station within the last one year.

"The total amount of property involved is Rs. 538.

"All these cases were duly investigated but had to be finally treated as undetected."

"The menial staff has been strengthened and a constable in mufti has been posted to patrol in the early hours of the morning, as precautionary measures."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Sir, in cases of such thefts may I know whether it is the duty of the hostel authorities or the duty of the Members who live in the hostel to report the thefts to the police authorities?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"It is not the duty of anybody, Sir. But it is in the interest of the person who lost the property to complain." (Laughter.)

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I know, Sir, whether the Hon. Chief Minister is aware that part of it is due to the fact that the hostel is not provided with proper compound walls and some of the openings are not provided with doors?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, these thefts in my opinion are internal thefts." (Laughter.)

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I ask the Hon. Chief Minister to tell us what he means by 'internal thefts'?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"What I mean, Sir, is that people do not scale over the walls and steal, but people who have an opportunity and who are already inside manage to steal something which they very much need." (Laughter.)

[26th November 1952]

SRI A. RAMASAMY THEVAR:—" Being one of the victims of such thefts, and as such thefts are going on even today, may I request the Government to take extra precautions to prevent such thefts occurring in future? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" Sir, firstly, it is better not to have any valuable property in these temporary lodgings. Secondly, if we have any, we must keep an eye over them. Thirdly, when we leave the room we must carry them with us." (Laughter.)

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD:—" నా సూములూ కూడా అపహరించడం జరిగింది. హాస్టలులో నియమించబడినటువంటి చిన్న నౌకర్లు ఇటువంటివనులు చేయకుండా ప్రధానమంత్రి విమిచర్య తీసుకొంటారు? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" మీరిది ముఖ్యమైన విషయమని అనుకోంతు దీనికే నోటీసు ఇవ్వాలి."

Memorial from the Pensioners' Association, Cannanore.

11 a.m. * 158 Q.—**SRI T. VISWANATHAM:** Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government received a memorial from 216 members of the Pensioners' Association, Cannanore, requesting restoration of the cut in the rates of the dearness allowance and for other reliefs; and

(b) if so, what action the Government have taken?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—" (a) & (b) Yes. The requests were—

- (i) To rescind the order of cut in the rates of dearness allowance to pensioners and to enhance the rates, so as to bring them to the level of those granted to the non-gazetted servants in active service.
- (ii) To extend similar relief to retired non-gazetted servants drawing a pension of above Rs. 110.
- (iii) To extend the educational concessions granted to the dependants of military men and to the children of pensioners also.

"The existing rates of dearness allowance granted to pensioners of this Government drawing pensions not exceeding Rs. 100 per mensem follow those adopted by the Government of India and all other State Governments. The rates were enhanced in 1947 without reference to the rates of dearness allowance granted to pensioners of the Central Government or other Provincial Governments and considerable additional expenditure was involved in the enhancement. These rates were reduced to the old level with effect from the 1st January 1948, 4½ or 5 years ago.

26th November 1952]

“ Neither the Government of India nor any of the State Governments have sanctioned temporary increase to pensions exceeding Rs. 100 per mensem. It was considered by the Government that there was no justification to sanction to pensioners dearness allowance at the same rates as those adopted in the case of Government servants.

“ The educational concessions referred to in the petition were intended only for the benefit of children and dependants of Defence Services personnel and could not be extended to others. Those concessions which were previously granted to dependants of military men at the expense of the Provincial Government have since been withdrawn. The Post-war Services Reconstruction Fund Committee is now meeting the entire expenditure involved in the grant of these concessions.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“ In view of the rise in the cost of living since 1948 and also in view of the fact that these petitions have been pending since 1948, will the Government at least consider the restoration? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ The increase is not only for the pensioners but for the entire community. So we cannot consider the increase in dearness allowance to pensioners alone.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“ But the pensioners have got to live, Sir. In view of the difficulty to which the pensioners are put due to the cut effected in the rate of their dearness allowance, will the Government specifically reconsider their case? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ The existing rates of dearness allowance granted to pensioners of this Government follow those adopted by the Government of India and all other State Governments. The rates of dearness allowance were enhanced in 1947 without reference to the rates of the Centre and other State Governments. The rates were reduced to the old level with effect from 1st January 1948, i.e., about five years ago, when I think, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was a member of the party in charge of the Government.”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR:—“ In view of the fact that a cut in the pensioners' dearness allowance is considered a 'dattapaharam' (taking back a gift) and a sin according to moral principle, and in view of the fact that there are pensioners who are getting pensions in one digit, will the Government at least reconsider the restoration of the cut? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ I am really pleased to hear the hon. Member talking on moral principles; but that is only a matter of opinion. Here we are concerned with rules and regulations. As such we cannot consider the hon. Member's request.”

[26th November 1952]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"In view of the fact that the dearness allowance of Government servants has been increased since 1948, will the Government restore the cut effected in the dearness allowance of pensioners?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"In view of our acute financial position, we are not in a position to increase the dearness allowance of pensioners."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU — "పంద రూపాయలకు పైన పెంషన్ తీసుకొనేవారికి ఈ cut ను restore చేయడం జరిగినదా? ఈ cut ను restore చేసిన తరువాత Central Government పెంషన్ల కిచ్చే dearness allowances rate కు Madras Government ఇచ్చే dearness allowance rate కు ఏమైనా వ్యత్యాసమున్నదా?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I want notice, Sir."

Memorial from the Pensioners' Association, Cannanore.

* 159 Q.—**SRI K. P. GOPALAN:** Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state whether the Government received a memorial, dated the 26th October 1952, signed by the President of the Pensioners' Association, Cannanore, requesting the restoration of the cut in the dearness allowance imposed in G.O. No. 45, Finance (Pension), dated the 22nd January 1947, and if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Yes. The Government considered it unnecessary to restore the cut made in 1948, as no other State Government or the Central Government were paying dearness allowance to pensioners at the higher rates sanctioned by this Government in 1947. The restoration of the higher rates would involve considerable extra expenditure of a recurring nature, and the Government see no justification for it, under the present financial conditions."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"The Hon. Minister for Finance has just now stated that in view of the acute financial position of the Government they are not in a position to restore the cut in the dearness allowance of pensioners. May we have an assurance from the Hon. Minister that no further cut (if not restoration) will be imposed on their pension?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I cannot give any assurance. Everything will be decided according to the money available with the Government."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—"Is there any irreducible minimum which should be given to pensioners whatever salary they might have been drawing while on active service?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"A separate question may be put."

26th November 1952]

Transaction of Government business in regional languages.

* 160 Q.—SRI V. V. RAMASAMI: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government introduced as an experimental measure the transaction of Government business in Tamil in the Government offices in Tiruchirappalli district; and

(b) whether the Government consider that the results of the experiment warrant its extension to other Tamil districts also?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“(a) Yes.

“(b) The question of extending the scheme to other districts was considered and it was decided that it might be deferred for the present.”

SRI V. V. RAMASAMI:—“May I know from the Hon. Chief Minister the reason for deferring this question for the present?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“This is a process of gradual change and deferring it is in consonance with the policy of gradual change.”

SRI A. GOVINDASAMY NAYAKAR:—“அரசாங்க நடவடிக்கைகள் தமிழில் இருப்பதால் கஜானா என்பதற்கு கருவுலகம் என்றும், மோட்டார் கார் என்பதற்கு உந்து என்றும் பொது மக்களுக்குப் புரியாதபடி தமிழ்ச் சொற்களை அமைப்பதை மாற்றி பொது மக்களுக்குப் புரியக்கூடிய வகையில் தமிழ் வார்த்தைகளை அமைப்பார்களாவென்று நான் கேட்கிறேன்?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“பாஷை நிதானமாகத் தான் மாறும். இடையில் பல்வேறு விதமாக மாறும். கடைசியில் முடிவாக சரியாக மாறும்.”

SRI Y. MANJAYA SHETTY:—“May I know why this experiment has not been extended to the Kannada and Malayalam districts when it has been tried in Tamil and Telugu districts? Why is this sort of discrimination made?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“In every gradual process there is prudential discrimination. This discrimination has something to do with wisdom and should not be understood in the sense of partiality.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“In view of the experiment being termed as gradual, will the Hon. the Chief Minister introduce it in one taluk each of Malabar and South Kanara?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“We will watch the result in the Telugu area, Sir.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“It is working very well in Telugu districts.”

SRI P. B. K. RAJACHIDAMBARAM:—“Have the Government received any representation regarding the difficulty in the implementation of this scheme at least from Tiruchirappalli?”

[26th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I think the hon. Member is suggesting that I have received one and if so asking whether I would agree to such representation. Let me say to the hon. Member that I have not till now seen such a representation, but I feel that many difficulties must have been experienced."

SRI P. SYAMASUNDARA RAO:—"తమిళ జిల్లాలలోపరనే తెలుగు జిల్లాలలోకూడా ప్రాంతీయ భాష ద్వారా ప్రభుత్వ వ్యవహారాలు జరుపుకున్నారా?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The hon. Member is not aware that the experiment is being carried on in Telugu districts also."

SRI T. ANANTA PAI:—"Are the Government crediting the people of the Kannada districts with wisdom, because this experiment is not sought to be extended to South Kanara?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"There is no question of wisdom being appraised districtwar, Sir. The question is experimenting wisely, which is examined by Government."

11-10
a.m.

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY:—"Sir, how, in the opinion of the Government, is this experiment working? Is it working successfully or not?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"We have not yet come to any conclusion, Sir."

SRI V. V. RAMASAMI:—"Will the Hon. the Chief Minister give us an assurance that even though some difficulties are experienced in this experiment, the principle of conducting the administration in the regional language will not be given up?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Even at the cost of a little time, I might make my position clear. There are many reforms to be made in the world. Language has to be reformed. Administration has also to be reformed and has to be maintained also. When we try to reform one thing we should not become fanatical about that particular thing. We should keep other things also in our mind. For instance, if for the sake of language we try to do something in courts, we may do injustice to the parties concerned. Therefore we have to keep all things together in our mind and not imagine that language reform is our only goal."

Paper used in Government offices.

* 161 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether Indian or foreign paper is used for Government stationery purposes;

(b) whether the letter paper, envelopes, etc., supplied to the Members of the Legislature are of Indian or foreign make; and

26th November 1952]

(c) in case foreign paper is supplied in part, what is its proportion to the total supply for the above two items?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—“(a) For writing and printing purposes, only Indian paper is used. But for special purposes such as drawing, tracing and making ledgers, foreign paper is used, as suitable Indian-made paper is not available.

“(b) The letter papers and envelopes supplied to the Members of the Legislature are of Indian make only.

“(c) Does not arise.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO:—“శాసన సభ్యులకు ఇవ్వచున్న కాగితముల వలె చాలా అధికంగా ఉన్నది. ఈ stationery కి పెంచు ధర నిర్ణయించడం ద్వారా లాభం పొందవలసిన ప్రభుత్వంవారి ఉద్దేశమా?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—“Some stationery is supplied free to the Members of the Legislature and some is for sale. I cannot agree that the cost is extraordinary.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“May I know, Sir, whether the Hon. Minister is aware that that part of the stationery which is freely supplied to the Members is very poor in quality compared with the quality of paper which we are asked to purchase, and whether this kind of gift is quite in keeping with the dignity of the Government?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—“It is a matter which affects the dignity of the whole House as well as the Government. There is no motive in supplying poor quality paper especially to the Legislators.”

Fees in the Registration offices in Guntur district.

* 162 Q.—SRI K. SUBBA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received complaints that in several Registration offices in the Guntur district, persons presenting documents for registration are asked to pay double the amount of registration fee on pain of being refused registration of document; and

(b) if so, whether the Government will make an enquiry?

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU:—“(a) No. Government have received complaints of corruption against certain Sub-Registrars in that district, but on enquiry the charges were found not proved.

“(b) Does not arise.”

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI:—“గుంటూరు జిల్లాలోని, పల్నాడు, గురజాల, మాతెర్ల మొదలైన పట్టణాలలోఉన్న Sub-Registrar కచ్చేరీలలో, రిజిస్ట్రేషన్ ఫీజు ఎంతో అంత లంచంకూడా తీసుకుంటున్నారనే విషయం అందరకు తెలిసినట్టిదే. ఈ విషయమై అనేక complaints వచ్చినట్లు కొన్ని కొట్లాటలుకూడా జరిగినట్లు ప్రభుత్వం వారికి తెలుసా?”

[26th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—“ As I have already said, no complaint such as is referred to in the original question has been received either by the Government or by the Inspector-General of Registration. The Inspector-General has however reported that complaints alleging corruption on the part of Sub-Registrars of Ongole and other places were received by him and that the enquiry conducted did not bring home the guilt of corruption.”

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ ఈ విషయంలో గుంటూరు జిల్లానుంచి complaints వచ్చినట్లయితే మంత్రిగారు విచారిస్తారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—“ Certainly.”

Auctioning of forest blocks in Pudukkottai division.

* 163 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the agriculturists of Pudukkottai division of the Tiruchirappalli district have petitioned the Government for the revival of the auctioning of forest blocks in their division for green manure purposes; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ (a) No, Sir.

“ (b) Does not arise.”

Allowances paid to the temporary staff employed during the Assembly meetings, dated June-July 1952.

* 164 Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state how much extra money and the rate at which such an amount was paid to the staff including the temporarily appointed peons for working more hours during the last Assembly sitting, i.e., Budget Session?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ The total amount paid to the staff, including temporary staff (clerks and peons) employed for the meeting days during the last Budget Session of the Assembly was Rs. 439. The rate of payment was Re. 1-8-0 per day per Superintendent or Reporter, Re. 1 per day per clerk and Re. 0-8-0 per day per peon.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ శాసనసభ కార్యాలయ ఉద్యోగులకు వారి వారి హెచ్చదలను బట్టి, రూ 1-8-0, 1-0-0, 0-8-0 లు చొప్పున ఇచ్చిన మొత్తం చాలా తక్కువగా ఉన్నది కనుక దానిని పెంచి ఈ సమావేశ సందర్భంలో కూడా వారు హెచ్చుకాలం పనిచేస్తున్నారు కనుక, అదనపు బత్తెం ఇవ్వడంపై రేమో మంత్రిగారు శలవిస్తారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ I want notice, Sir.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Are the Government aware that the overtime allowance and wages of Rs. 1-8-0, Re. 1 and Re. 0-8-0

26th November 1952]

paid to the Superintendent and other personnel during the last Budget Session is negligible when compared to the amount of labour that is involved in this work? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ As far as I know, they are more than satisfied; I don't think that Members should instigate them to be dis-satisfied and discontented.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“ Apart from the insinuation of the Hon. Finance Minister that Members are instigating, them, may I know whether the Government are paying them any extra allowance during this session as we are working for one hour more every day? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ Last time it was not merely one hour; the sittings continued till 7-30 or 8-00 in the night. But this time for the extra one hour we are working, we are giving a day off on Saturdays.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ కనుక నేను దిగా తెలిసేటట్లు విషయంగా చెబుతాను: మంత్రిగారు ఆర్థిక సేవ కోసం నచ్చు.

“ గత ఆసెంబ్లీ సమావేశ కాలంలో సిబ్బంది నోజూ రెండు, మూడు గంటలు అధికంగా పనిచేసినందుకు వారికి విశ్రాంతి పాత్రనా allowance ఇవ్వబడ్డాయి. ఈ సమావేశ సందర్భంలో కూడా వారు పాత్రనా కాలం పనిచేయవలసి వస్తున్నది కనుక బత్రేము ఇవ్వడం వారికి మంత్రిగారు తెలియజేస్తారా? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ Notice, Sir.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Before the conclusion of the last Budget Session, the Hon. Chief Minister made a specific promise that payment of cash bonus would be made to all the staff that was employed in the Legislative Assembly. Has anything been done by way of fulfilment of that promise? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ I will look into that. I want notice, Sir.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—“ Is it a fact that the extra allowance and wages that were paid during the last Budget Session are not now being paid and that the staff are even now working outside their legitimate working hours till 9-00 in the night? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ If it is brought to the notice of the Government and if it is necessary, certainly extra allowance will be paid.”

Lanka lands leased out to the Field Labour Co-operative Societies, Krishna district.

* 165 Q.—SRI V. RAMA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any report that in certain blocks of the lanka lands leased out to the Field Labour Co-operative Societies of Ibrahimpatnam, Jupudi and Kotanakonda, Krishna district, crops were not possible to be raised for the fasli 1361; and

[26th November 1952]

(b) if so, whether the Government have taken any steps to grant them remission of the rentals?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—

“(a) Yes.

“(b) The matter is under examination by the Collector of Krishna and the Board of Revenue. The Board of Revenue is competent to sanction remission of rentals up to a maximum of Rs. 2,500 in each case.”

SRI V. RAMA RAO :—“గత సంవత్సరం రెవిన్యూ అధికారులు ఈ ఖాతులను తనిఖీచేసి పెరులు పాడై పోయినట్లు ఫీజువరి కేలలో తెల్పారు. తాత్కాలికంగా పన్నులు వసూలుచేయడం నిషేధించలేదు. జమాబందీ సందర్భములో కూడా పన్నులు వసూలుచేయడం దిశబద్ధం చేయలేదు. కాని September నెలలో పన్నులు వసూలుచేశారు. ఇది అన్యాయం కాబట్టి వసూలుచేసిన మొత్తాలను రైతులకు తిరిగి వాపసుచేయిస్తారా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“It looks as though some remissions might be granted, Sir.”

11-20
a.m.

SRI A. VENKATARAMA RAJU :—“అర్యా, ఈ లంక ఖాతుల విషయంలో తూర్పు గోదావరి జిల్లాలో గత 30 ఏళ్లుగా సాగుచేస్తున్న రైతులను కూడా తొలగించి వెస్తున్నారనే విషయం మంత్రిగారికి తెలుసునా? అయితే యేమి చర్య తీసుకున్నారు?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“We are dealing with Krishna district, not East Godavari.”

SRI P. SYAMASUNDARA RAO :—“అనేక ప్రాంతాలలో పంటలు పండినప్పటికీ ధనవంతులైన ఖాస్సాములకు రెమిషన్లు ఇవ్వడం, పంటలుపోయినప్పటికీ వేద రైతులపై పూర్తి పన్ను విధించడం జరుగుచున్నారనే విషయం మంత్రిగారికి తెలుసా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
“All that will be looked into by the proper authorities.”

SRI G. BAPANAYYA :—“కృష్ణా జిల్లాలో లంక ఖాతులు ఎక్కడ వల్ల, ఇసుక మేటి వేయటవల్ల పాడగుచున్నవనీ విషయం, అనేక ఖాతులలో అలా పంటకూడా పండినప్పటికీ రెమిషన్ ఇవ్వడంలేదనీ విషయం మంత్రిగారు ఎరుగుదురా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
“I have already said that remissions might be granted.”

Roads laid under the Famine Relief Scheme in Rayalaseema.

* 166 Q.—SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state whether the roads laid under the Famine Relief Scheme in Rayalaseema are going to be maintained by the District Boards or by the Highways Department?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“The roads will be maintained by the District Boards or panchayats concerned in whose jurisdiction they are laid.”

26th November 1952]

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH:—"May I know, Sir, what steps the Government are going to take to repair the roads which have gone to ruins in the Cuddapah district?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Hon. Minister has said that the roads have been handed over to the district boards and the panchayat boards."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"మంత్రిగారు మా ప్రాంతంనుంచి వచ్చినవారే కనుక ఈ ఫా.ఎ.క్ రోడ్లనుగుంచి వారికి తాగుగా తెలిసేటటుంది. ఇవి ఎల్లప్పుడూ ఫ్యామి రోడ్లుగానే ఉంటున్నాయి. వాటికి నివేదించేయించే విషయమై ప్రభుత్వం ఏమైనా శ్రద్ధ తీసుకుంటున్నారా?"

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—"Wherever repairs are necessary, the district boards will attend to them."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"నా ప్రశ్నకు సరియైన సమాధానం లేదు. ఈ రోడ్లు పుట్టినప్పటినుంచి పాడైపోయేవరకు ఫ్యామి రోడ్లుగానే ఉంటున్నాయి. ఈ రోడ్లమీద బొడ్డు బోలెబొట్టని రోజుండవని మంత్రిగారికి తెలుసు. కాబట్టి వాటిని పడేయచేసి సరియైన స్థితిలో ఉంచే విషయం మంత్రిగారు చూచిచూస్తారా?"

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—"I have already answered that repairs will be attended to by the district boards or the panchayat boards concerned."

Appointment of librarians under the District Libraries Committees.

* 167 Q.—**SRI K. KRISHNA RAO:** Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether there are a set of directions to the District Library Committees to have librarians who are trained and if so, how many Committees have such trained librarians under their employ; and

(b) the service conditions of the librarians under the District Libraries Committee?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—" (a) Under rule 42 (1) (c) of the Madras Public Libraries Rules, 1950, the Chairmen of the Local Library Authorities should, on application, obtain suitable candidates from the Secretary of the State Library Committee for employment in the libraries under their jurisdiction. Seven Authorities have been provided with graduate librarians trained in Diploma Course in Library Science.

" (b) The question of prescribing suitable qualifications, grades and scales of pay for librarians employed under Local Library Authorities is under consideration."

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO:—"నా రెండవ ప్రశ్నకు సమాఖ్య ఇవ్వలేదు."

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—"I have stated that it is under consideration. The State Library Committee which met in March last formed a sub-committee consisting of Sri R. Janardhanam Nayudu, Sri K. N. Sivaraman and

[26th November 1952]

the Deputy Director of Public Instruction in charge of libraries, to go into the question of the qualifications, the revision of the scales of pay and other conditions of service for librarians. The sub-committee's report will be placed before the State Library Committee which is to meet this month; and afterwards, it will come before the Government."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Is the Hon. Education Minister aware of the fact that in most districts, district library committees have not started district libraries, and in Madras also the Madras District Library Committee has not started a Central Library?"

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—"Out of the 26 Local Library Authorities, twenty authorities have already opened district main libraries. I need not read the list now. Of the remaining six local authorities, the districts of Kurnool, Ramanathapuram, the Nilgiris and Madras City have not been able to establish the main libraries for want of suitable accommodation. The Visakhapatnam local authority has secured a building, but it has not yet opened the main library there. The Salem district local authority's report in regard to the opening of its main library is still awaited. The Accommodation Officer, Madras, has been instructed to secure a suitable building for the Madras Local Library Authority by giving it a high priority. In the meanwhile, the authority is also negotiating for the purchase of a private building in Egmore for the purpose."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"జిల్లా లైబ్రరీ కమిటీలు నియమించే లైబ్రరీయనులకు ఎట్టి అర్హతలుండవలె? స్టెయిన్మన్ ఈ సుధ్య విధాన శాఖాధికారులు ఉత్తరువులు జారీచేశారు. ఇదివరకే లైబ్రరీయనులుగా పనిచేస్తున్న వారిలో కొందరు ఇట్టి అర్హతలు లేకపోయినప్పటికీ ఎంతోకాలంగా సమర్థతతో లైబ్రరీలను నిర్వహిస్తున్నారు. అటువంటి వారి సర్వీసును అనుభవాన్ని కూడా దృష్టిలో ఉంచుకొని లైబ్రరీయనులను నియమిస్తారా? అలాగే కొంత విస్తరణ చేసి వారికొక పాఠశాలను పెట్టి training ఇప్పిస్తారా? అని అడుగుతున్నాను."

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—"I have stated that the question of revision of the scales of pay and the conditions of service is under consideration by a sub-committee to which I have already made reference. We are awaiting its report. It will go before the State Library Committee. At present, the librarians engaged, receive Rs. 75-5-145."

* 168 Q.—**SRI K. P. GOPALAN:**—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will put the question to-morrow."

MR. SPEAKER:—"All right."

Bus fares in the Kozhikode and Kakkodi route.

* 169 Q.—**SRI A. APPU:** Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state whether any action has been taken on the memorandum submitted to him by the members

26th November 1952]

of the public of Kakkodi amsom of Kozhikode taluk at Kozhikode on 24th August 1952 regarding the revision of the existing passenger fares between Kozhikode and Kakkodi collected by the operators running buses on that route? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ The route Kozhikode to Kakkodi is a mufassal route and under the existing orders the operators are entitled to charge a minimum fare of five annas. The route could not be declared as a City route as more than half the length of the route is beyond municipal limits. The Regional Transport Authority, Malabar at its meeting held on 22nd September 1952 has approved the proposal for the introduction of a town service between Kozhikode and Karaparamba with two buses and is taking further action in the matter. When this new town service is introduced with two buses, it is likely that the operators on the route Kozhikode to Kakkodi will reduce their fares.”

* 170 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—“ Sir, may this question be taken up to-morrow? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ No objection.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ After all, Sir, there may be more important questions to-morrow. I think it is always safe to answer the questions then and there.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ There is only one more minute left for questions and probably the hon. Member wants to put supplementary questions. It may therefore be taken up to-morrow.”

Tour programmes of Hon. Ministers.

* 171 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANASWAMY: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) what the object of Ministers' tours is;

(b) popular organizations to which Ministers' tour programmes are sent; and

(c) whether such tour programmes are fixed in consultation with the local officials and M.L.As.?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ (a) Generally to keep in touch with affairs in addition to fulfilling any particular local requests of sufficient importance.

“ (b) Such organizations as each Minister in his personal capacity considers it desirable in the interests of cordial relationship and good administration.

“ (c) Yes. As far as possible.”

SRI M. NARAYANASWAMY : —“ మంత్రి పర్యటనలు కొన్ని ప్రముఖ విషయాలకు సంబంధించినవిగానే ఉంటాయని, ప్రజా సంస్థలకు వారి పర్యటనల విషయం తెలియజేయబడుతుందని, ప్రధానామత్తులు చెప్పారు. కాని అనేక సందర్భాలలో స్థానిక శాసన సభ్యులకు తెలియకుండానే పర్యటనలు జరుపబడుతున్నాయి. ఏ

[26th November 1952]

విషయము ప్రాముఖ్యమైనవి, వీని ఆచూకము, ఖ్యమైనవి అనే విషయమే స్థానిక సభ్యుల కోరిక. సుత్రాలు రెండువదింపడంలేదు. స్థానిక అధికారులకు, శాసన సభ్యులను సంబంధించకుండా వీ హార్టీ ప్రమాదనాల నిమిత్తమే”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ It looks like a long speech.”

11-30
a.m.

SRI M. NARAYANASWAMY:—“ నేను ప్రశ్న వేస్తున్నాను. కొంచెం ఓపికగా చలించిపట్లయితే ఆ విషయం తమకు బాధపడుతుంది.

“ మంత్రులు అనేక గ్రామాలకు వీ పని లేక యినా వెళ్లి అవసరంగా ప్రభుత్వ ధనాన్ని పర్యటనల నిమిత్తం వెచ్చిస్తున్నారు. ఆ గ్రామాలకు వారు వెళ్లవలసిన అగత్యంమాడా ఉన్నవి. ఉంటేయే. కాబట్టి వీ ప్రాంతాలకు మంత్రులు రావలసి ఉంటుంది అనే విషయమే స్థానిక R.D.O. లను, శాసన సభ్యులను మంత్రులు ఇక ముందేం పంపలేదు అని కోరుతున్నాను. మంత్రుల tour programme అవసరమైన సంస్థలకు పంపుతున్నారన్నారు. ఆ సంస్థల పేర్లుకూడా చెప్పండి. ”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ It seems to be a very long compound sentence.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ In the guise of speaking in their mother-tongue interpellators are making long speeches.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The difficulty is that I do not know that language.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“ I know something of that language and the genius of that language is like that, Sir. When they are putting a question, it looks like a speech.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ The genius of the language closely follows the genius of the people.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Question time over. Answers for the rest of the questions will be printed in the proceedings.”

Industrial dispute in the Parli Kumar Industries, Palghat.

* 172 Q.—SRI R. KRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any memorandum regarding the Industrial dispute at the Parli Kumar Industries, Palghat, Malabar; and

(b) if so, what the action taken by the Government is?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“ (a) Two petitions, dated 16th September 1952 and 2nd October 1952 regarding the dismissal of workers were received.

“ (b) The petitions were forwarded to Commissioner of Labour for necessary action. The Commissioner has since reported that as the parties had come to an agreement on 1st October 1952, no action was taken by him in the matter.”

26th November 1952]

Rural Medical Training Centres.

* 173 Q.—SRI G. SATYANARAYANA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state the number of Rural Medical Training Centres run by the Government in the State?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—“There are no rural medical training centres run by Government.”

Gruel centres in South Arcot district.

* 174 Q.—SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have any proposals to declare the South Arcot district a famine area under the Famine Code; and

(b) how many gruel centres have been opened in the said district?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“(a) There is no proposal at present to declare the South Arcot district as a Famine area under the Famine Code.

“(b) Nine gruel centres are functioning in the district.”

Opening of a Munsif's Court at Payyanoor.

* 175 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state whether the Government have sent any recommendation to the High Court to open a Munsif's Court at Payyanoor?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—“The answer is in the negative.”

Dearness allowance to the employees of the former Pudukkottai State Devasthanam Department.

* 176 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments be pleased to state—

(a) whether all the employees of the former Pudukkottai State Devasthanam Department have been given an increased rate of dearness allowance;

(b) if so, from what date and at what rate;

(c) whether it is a fact that the grant has not been universal or uniform; and

(d) if so, why and the basis on which the grant was made?

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU:—“(a) No. The Government are examining the question.

“(b) to (d) Does not arise.”

[26th November 1952]

Applications for assignment of lands.

* 177 Q.—SRI P. NARASIMHA REDDI: Will be Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the reasons why 1st July 1952 has been fixed as the last date for receipt of applications for assignment of lands (pattas) from the landless poor, in G.O. No. 2600, Revenue, dated 4th October 1951; and

(b) whether it is a fact that as nearly as 2,000 applications for assignment of land are time-barred in Cuddappah district alone?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“(a)

In order to complete the work of granting land to ex-service-men and landless poor persons as early as possible, the Government fixed the last day for the receipt of applications as 1st July 1952, which is the first day of the fasli year next to that in which the orders were issued. Under the revised priority scheme, there is, however, no time limit for the receipt of applications from landless poor persons.

“(b) The Government have no information.”

Subsistence allowance to Burma evacuees.

* 178 Q.—SRI M. K. PADMAPRABHA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that State officials in Malabar are compelling dependants in India of Indian Nationals in Burma to repay what the Government of India had given them as subsistence allowance when war broke out in South-East Asia and during the war;

(b) if so, why the present demand is being made; and

(c) the conditions under which the original allowance was given?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“(a), (b) & (c) During the last war, the Government of India started a scheme of financial assistance to help the evacuees from Burma, Malaya, etc., and the dependants in India of Indians stranded overseas, in order to enable them to get themselves absorbed in the economic life of this country. The assistance given under the scheme was in the shape of repayable loans against written undertakings to repay. Presumably the hon. Member refers to this repayable advance in his question. No subsistence allowance was granted to the evacuees. As the advances are repayable, recovery is now being effected in all districts from all those who took repayable advances in accordance with the instructions of the Government of India. To obviate hardship, the financial position of each grantee is fully considered before any recovery is ordered. In cases where the chances of recovery are remote, the amounts are written off.”

* 179 Q.—Postponed for answer on 27th November 1952.

26th November 1952]

Purchase of stores in England.

* 180 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state in the matter of purchase of stores in England—

(a) the reasons as to why, when stores of the value only of Rs. 23.64 lakhs and Rs. 29.07 lakhs were purchased in 1950–51 and 1951–52, respectively, provision is made for a total purchase in England in 1952–53 for Rs. 162.14 lakhs;

(b) whether orders for stores budgeted for purchase were available only in England and not from any Indian manufacturer in India; and

(c) whether in the case of stores that have inevitably to be purchased from England or other foreign countries quotations from other countries for similar stores of equally good or superior quality are obtained?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“(a) The large provision made for the purchase of stores from abroad in 1952 to 1953 as compared with the previous years is mainly due to the large demands made by the Electricity Department (Rs. 118 lakhs) for the purchase of plant and machinery such as synchronous condensers, power transformers, towers, Penstock pipes, hydraulic machinery, generating plant and switch gear for the new Electricity projects, namely Machkund Scheme, Madras Thermal Scheme, Pykara Extensions and Tungabhadra Hydro Electric Scheme and other Schemes which are nearing completion.

“(b) It has been laid down in the Madras Financial Code that preference for making purchases should be given in the following order:—

Firstly, to articles which are produced in India in the form of raw materials, or are manufactured in India from raw materials produced in India;

Secondly, to articles wholly or partially manufactured in India from imported materials;

Thirdly, to articles of foreign manufacture held in stock in India; and

Fourthly, to articles manufactured abroad which need to be specially imported.

The Purchasing Officers of the Government invariably follow this procedure. The items of purchases abroad including those made by the Electricity Department were not available in India or from Indian manufacturers.

“(c) The provision made in the budget under the head ‘Charges in England’ covers purchases to be made in other foreign countries also. The payments to be made in such

[26th November 1952]

countries as Switzerland, Belgium, Italy and Poland are made through the High Commissioner for India in London and hence that expenditure is shown as 'Charges in England'. In every case, the order is placed for the best offer on the open tender system taking into account technical superiority of the equipment concerned as well as its cost, irrespective of the country of manufacture."

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS.

Representation regarding Backward Classes.

55 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) the population of each community included in the list of Backward communities in the Madras State;

(b) whether any representations were received by the Government requesting for the constitution of a separate Statutory Welfare Board for Backward communities and also stating that funds hitherto allocated by the Government for their welfare are inadequate; and

(c) if so, the action taken so far?

A.—(a) In the recent census, there was no enumeration in the order of communities and therefore information regarding the total population of each community included in the list of Backward Classes is not available.

(b) No representation was received for the constitution of a separate Statutory Welfare Board for Backward Classes. However, representations were received from the Backward Classes League, Madras, that the Backward Classes Advisory Board should be invested with powers to administer the funds made available for the uplift of Backward Classes and that the allotment should be increased.

(c) As there is an advisory committee already under existence to advise Government in the matter of advancing the interests of the Backward Classes, the Government consider it unnecessary to constitute any other body with powers to distribute grants, etc.

An additional grant of Rs. 75,000 has since been sanctioned by the Government.

Starvation deaths in the State.

56 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state the number of deaths, if any, on account of starvation in 1951-52 in the State?

A.—Nil.

26th November 1952]

Photos of British Governors.

57 Q.—SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state whether the Government propose to remove the British Governors' photos from Rajaji Hall?

A.—Not only in the old Banqueting Hall but in other places throughout India there are many fine paintings belonging to the British period; and the question of how best to preserve these historic relics when terminating the present obvious incongruity in public exhibition has been exercising the minds of the departments concerned in the Governments of India and of the various States.

Dramatic performances for collecting funds for the Government Arts College hostel, Cuddapah.

58 Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) if any dramatic performances were contemplated on 9th, 10th and 11th November 1951 to collect funds for the construction and expansion of the hostel buildings of the Government Arts College, Cuddapah, by the College Hostel Committee;

(b) if so, how much money was realized;

(c) whether the dramas were enacted;

(d) whether accounts were published; and

(e) who was the president of the Hostel Committee in November 1951?

A.—(a) The Cuddapah College Hostel Building Committee proposed to conduct a benefit performance in November 1951 to raise funds of about forty thousand rupees for the work relating to the construction of the College Hostel Buildings.

(b) An amount of Rs. 2,225 was realized through the sale of tickets.

(c) & (d) The proposed benefit performance was postponed to February 1952, in view of the poor response; and the idea was later on abandoned in view of the famine conditions. The unsold tickets were called back. The amount realized was received by the Secretary and Treasurer of the Cuddapah College Committee and spent for the Hostel work. The unsold tickets and the accounts of the College Committee are with him. The accounts were not published.

(e) Sri N. Ranga Reddi, M.L.C., now Minister for Public Works, was the President of the Committee at that time.

[26th November 1952]

Expenditure on the Government Basic Training School buildings, Pallipad, Nellore district.

59 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state what the total expenditure is for the construction of building of the Government Basic Training School, Pallipad of Nellore district?

A.—The total expenditure on the construction of buildings for the Government Basic Training School, Pallipad, Nellore district, is Rs. 1,70,053.

Artesian wells in South Arcot district.

60 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) the number of artesian wells completed in the South Arcot district since the year 1948; and

(b) the amount spent so far on these wells?

A.—(a) The number of artesian wells so far completed in the South Arcot district since the year 1948 is 119, comprising 20 wells under the 20 wells scheme sanctioned in 1948 and 99 wells under the 101 wells scheme sanctioned in 1950. Of these 5 wells have proved to be unsuccessful.

(b) The amount spent so far on the construction of these wells is Rs. 6,48,400 (Rs. 1,32,000 under the 20 wells scheme and Rs. 5,16,400 under the 101 wells scheme).

Alleged discovery of a treasure-trove in Singapet, Nellore district.

61 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government received any representation in September 1952 about the discovery of gold worth about Rs. 30,000 in Singapet village of Nellore district, in June 1952; and

(b) if so, what the action taken by the Government under the Treasure Trove Act is?

A.—(a) & (b) The Collector of Nellore has reported that he received a petition in September 1952, from the member alleging the discovery of gold worth Rs. 30,000 in Singapet village of Kovur taluk, in June 1952. The Collector is enquiring into the matter in consultation with the Deputy Superintendent of Police.

Alleged cultivation of lands reserved for depressed classes by caste ryots.

62 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government received any representations from the members of Scheduled Castes of Nellore district in the year 1952 regarding the cultivation of lands reserved for the depressed classes by caste ryots in Nellore district; and

26th November 1952]

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

A.—(a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

Artesian wells sunk under the Grow More Food Campaign:

63 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) the number of artesian wells sanctioned in the year 1950 and 1951 respectively to be sunk under the Grow More Food scheme and in what districts;

(b) the number of wells completed in 1950 and 1951 respectively; and

(c) the amount spent for the purpose in 1950 and 1951 respectively?

A.—(a) One hundred and one artesian wells were sanctioned in 1950, all of them in the South Arcot district. No artesian wells were sanctioned in 1951.

(b) In 1950, 8 wells under the 20 artesian wells scheme in the South Arcot district sanctioned in 1948 and 3 wells under the 101 artesian wells scheme in the South Arcot district sanctioned in 1950 were completed. In 1951, 6 wells under the 20 wells scheme and 50 wells under the 101 wells scheme were completed.

(c) The amounts spent on the construction of artesian wells during the years 1950 and 1951 are as follows:—

1950.—Rupees 32,000 under the 20 wells scheme and Rs. 1,01,704 under the 101 wells scheme. The total expenditure in 1950 was Rs. 1,33,074.

1951.—Rupees 56,000 under the 20 wells scheme and Rs. 3,26,565 under the 101 wells scheme. The total expenditure in 1951 was Rs. 3,82,565.

Rural Industrialization Scheme of Sri M. Visveswarayya.

64 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Rural Welfare be pleased to state whether the Government have implemented Sri M. Visveswarayya's Industrialization Scheme for Rural Areas and, if so, in what districts and the names of the taluks that have been taken up for the purpose?

A.—The Rural Industrialization Scheme is now being implemented in Musiri taluk of Tiruchirappalli district and Nellore taluk of Nellore district as an experimental measure.

[26th November 1952]

Applications for pattas received in West Godavari.

65 Q.—SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO: [Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state the number of applications received for pattas and the number of pattas granted to (i) Harijans, (ii) Harijan Christians, and (iii) other landless poor up to 30th June 1952 as per G.O. No. 1523, Revenue, dated 11th June 1949, in West Godavari district?

A.—Applications have been received in thousands. The particulars asked for are not readily available as no record of the communities of the applicants has been kept.

Pay and daily fees of Public Prosecutors.

66 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representation from Coimbatore in the second week of October 1952 regarding the enhancement of pay of Public Prosecutors; and

(b) if so, at what stage the matter stands?

A.—(a) & (b) A representation has been received from the Public Prosecutors' Association requesting the Government to consider the resolutions passed at a Special Conference held at Madras on 12th October 1952. The resolutions relate to enhancement of pay and daily fee payable to Public Prosecutors. The matter is under consideration.

Oral examinations by the Madras Public Service Commission.

67 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether stenographic records of the *viva voce* examinations by the Madras Public Service Commission of candidates applying for Government services, are kept and maintained; and

(b) whether the Government have issued any instructions to the members of the Madras Public Services Commission to speak before candidates, disparagingly about the Andhra University, or the Andhras in general and if they have, the reasons therefor?

A.—(a) The answer is in the negative.

(b) There is no truth in these allegations which, on the face of them, it is very improper to make without adequate basis.

Calculation of officiating service and pay for pension.

68 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that salaries of non-gazetted officers of all departments were revised with effect from the 1st January 1947;

26th November 1952]

(b) whether it is a fact that officiating service would count for pension, only in the case of non-gazetted officers who retire after the 1st January 1948; and

(c) whether representations have been received from the Non-Gazetted Officers' Association that the order giving concession in the matter of pensions only in the case of non-gazetted officers who retire after the 1st January 1948 would work hardship to those who retired in 1947, and requesting relief even to those who may have retired in 1947, and if so what action was taken thereon?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) In the case of Government servants retiring from service on or after the 1st March 1950, officiating *service* in excess of five years will count for pension. As financial concessions are usually sanctioned with effect from the date of the order, retrospective effect was not given to the above order. The crucial date in this case is the 1st March 1950 and not the 1st January 1948. The Member probably refers to the concession of counting officiating *pay* to a limited extent which was sanctioned in 1951. This concession was not new. It was in fact continuance beyond the 31st December 1947, subject to certain restrictions, of the concession which was admissible from the 3rd September 1939 to the 31st December 1947. Therefore, Government servants who retired *before* the 1st January 1948 after officiating in higher posts were also entitled to the concession. The concessions referred to above, namely counting officiating *service* and officiating *pay* for pension are admissible, not only to non-gazetted Government servants but to gazetted servants also.

(c) As stated in the answer to clause (b) above, there is no hardship of the kind stated, and no representations on the subject have been received from the Non-Gazetted Officers' Association.

Qualifications of Rural Welfare Officers and Grama Sevaks.

69 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Rural Welfare be pleased to state whether any qualifications are prescribed for the Rural Welfare Officers and Grama Sevaks?

A.—No specific qualifications have actually been prescribed but the considerations that were borne in mind in selecting candidates to the posts in question at the time when the Rural Welfare Scheme was launched originally in the year 1946, were the following, namely :—

- (i) possession of necessary enthusiasm and aptitude for rural reconstruction work;
- (ii) organising capacity; and

[26th November 1952]

- (iii) ability to feel at home in rural surroundings, study the needs of the villagers with understanding and sympathy, evoke their confidence and secure their willing co-operation in pushing through schemes of rural uplift.

Besides the above aspects, persons possessing minimum general educational qualification, i.e., S.S.L.C., in the case of Grama Sevaks and a Degree in Arts or Science of a recognised University in the case of Rural Welfare Officers are now given preference in the matter of appointment.

Nominations to District Rural Welfare Committees.

70 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Rural Welfare be pleased to state the principle followed in selecting non-officials for nomination to serve on the Firka Development Committees in the various districts?

A.—The District Firka Development Committees are now known as District Rural Welfare Committees. The non-official members of these Committees are selected for nomination, based mainly on their real enthusiasm for Rural Reconstruction work and co-operative tendency, so that full local support for the successful working of the Rural Welfare Scheme is obtained. One local M.L.A. or M.L.C. and a member, if any, represented in the State Rural Welfare Board are also nominated, as their association will also be useful in the deliberations of the Committees. Non-official members for each District Committee are accordingly nominated on the following basis:—

- (a) Four prominent constructive workers—two of them being preferably from the firkas and centres selected and the other two being from the rest of the district; one of these four should be a District Board Member;
- (b) one Member, if any, from the district on the State Rural Welfare Board; and
- (c) one local M.L.A. or M.L.C.

Appointment under the emergency provisions in State Service.

71 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state the number of Government employees employed under emergency provisions under rule 9 (a) (i) of the Madras Ministerial Subordinate Service who are still in service?

A.—The time and labour involved in collecting the information from all over the State will not be commensurate with any good purpose the collection of such statistics may serve.

26th November 1952]

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

III.—MOTIONS FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

(1) EVICTION OF LANDLESS POOR IN MUSAVELI VILLAGE IN TANJORE DISTRICT.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I have received notice of a number of adjournment motions to discuss matters of urgent public importance. Dr. K. B. Menon has given notice of one and it reads as follows:—

‘ This House do adjourn to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the mass arrests and satyagraha in the Musaveli village of Tanjore district consequent on the large-scale evictions of landless poor from their lands by the Government for allotting them to ex-service men.’

I remember that when he gave this to me, he himself said that this question had been hanging fire for the last one year, but I wish to know from the hon. Member before I give a ruling what he has to say with regard to this motion.”

* DR. K. B. MENON:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, permit me to present this case.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ But let him not make a long speech. The hon. Member himself told me that it has been pending for the last one year.”

DR. K. B. MENON:—“ Not for one year, Sir. I was wrong in giving that figure if I did.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Then the hon. Member is correcting that now.”

DR. K. B. MENON:—“ I shall in the course of my statement

MR. SPEAKER:—“ But let it not be a long statement; a short statement will do.”

* DR. K. B. MENON:—“ I shall be very brief in presenting my case, Sir. Musaveli village is in Tanjore district. In 1944, about 1,300 acres of uncultivated waste lands were distributed among 300 families under the Sivoijama Scheme. These lands were taken up by poor peasants. Among them were many Harijans and each family received from one to five acres of land. These people thought that the lands would be theirs and they invested all their accumulated earnings and constructed irrigation channels at their own expense and effected other improvements in order to make the lands cultivable. In 1950–51 a survey of the village was conducted and the plots were marked out and numbers were allotted and the peasants were paying their kist. One bright morning in June 1952, the villagers heard the village announcer beating the tom-tom, announce that the Government

[Dr. K. B. Menon] [26th November 1952]

had decided to take their lands away and give the same to co-operatives to be distributed to ex-service men. It was only then that they realised that the Government had changed their mind."

MR. SPEAKER:—"On what date was it?"

* DR. K. B. MENON:—"In June 1952; I think it was on the 27th June because I am not quite sure of the date. It was only then that the villagers realized that the Government had changed their mind and the lands would no longer be with them but will be taken away from them in order to be given away to ex-service men. This came as a terrible shock to the villagers and they ran helter-skelter to the Collector and everyone in order to prevent their land being taken away from them but nothing was done and the only thing they could do was to resort to *satyagraha*. I ask, Sir, was it necessary for the Government to have resorted to eviction of these people in order to provide for ex-service men? Nobody contends that ex-service men should not be provided with lands, but we do contend that it was not necessary for the Government to take away the lands from the peasants to provide for ex-service men. There is plenty of land available in the same village and also in the neighbouring taluk. There are thousands of acres of cultivable land that can be conveniently given to ex-service men and the Government could have provided ex-service men with such lands and avoided taking the lands from the poor peasants. In the second place, there was no urgency in the matter because even these ex-service men to whom the lands had been given, have not taken advantage of it, because up to date, only 22 of them have shown themselves on the scene and have taken possession of the land. They seem to be very reluctant to beat their swords and guns into ploughshares, and they do not really seem to want to do it. Why then are the Government so anxious to deprive the poor peasants of their lands and hand them over to the ex-service men who will not take them? I feel, Sir, that this is against all canons of justice and fairness. I think that it is against the voluntary assurance that the then Chief Minister himself gave, that the lands given under the Sivoijama Scheme would not be taken from those who had taken possession of them and it is also against the priority fixed by the Government in the distribution of land. The first to be served according to Government are the poor landless people including Harijans, and next preference is to be given to political sufferers and the ex-service men come last. With regard to Tanjore the Government promulgated an Ordinance and then came forward with a Bill to prevent evictions. I do not know why the Government themselves are committing acts which would make them guilty of the same offence against which they are providing safeguards by means of the Bill. What I say to Government is, 'Physician, heal thyself'."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I did not hear the date properly. May I know what it is, Sir?"

DR. K. B. MENON:—"27th June 1952."

26th November 1952]

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ Whatever may be your ruling, Sir, if the hon. Member has a grievance about the matter, I would request him to send it up to Government. They will look into the matter and there is no need to make a motion for adjournment.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I have heard the hon. Member. I really sympathize with those poor people who have been evicted from their lands. I am not going to enter into the merits of the matter. As far as the Chair is concerned, the question is whether it can be admitted as an adjournment motion or not. I really sympathize with those who have been evicted, but I know that our sympathetic Chief Minister will look into it and do justice to them. Let me point out to the hon. Member that he himself told me that the evictions took place in June last, and so the question has been there for the last six months. So, it is not an urgent matter and I rule it out of order.”

(2) ELECTIONS TO MINOR PANCHAYATS BY SHOW OF HANDS.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Two hon. Members have given notice of adjournment motions, more or less on the same lines. Let me first take the adjournment motion of Sri Sankarayya. The motion reads as follows:—” 11-40 a.m.

‘ This House stands adjourned to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, viz., the impending elections to the minor panchayat boards in the State of Madras by show of hands instead of by secret ballot which is the recognized democratic method.’

Let me hear what the hon. Member has to say on this motion.”

*SRI B. SANKARAYYA :—“ ఒక్కటికే యీ మైనరు పంచాయతీ ఎన్నికలు ప్రారంభించినట్లు తెలుస్తున్నది. ఈ విధంగా యీ ఎన్నికలు ప్రారంభించినట్లయితే అప్పుడు రాష్ట్రములో అనేక గ్రామాలలో చాలా ప్రజాపక్ష పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడేటటువంటి ప్రమాదాలు ఉన్నవి. అందువలన యిప్పుడు ఈ అసెంబ్లీలో ఈ రోజు కార్యక్రమము ఆపుదలచేయించి, యీ ఎన్నికల విషయం ముఖ్యంగా చర్చించుట అవసరమైయున్నది. ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు జరుపుతున్న పంచాయతీ ఎన్నికలు ప్రాథమికమైనటువంటి ప్రజాస్వామ్యానికి విరుద్ధముగా నడపబడుచున్నవి. ఈ విధంగా ఎన్నికలు పెట్టడమనేది మన రాష్ట్రములో పెద్ద ప్రమాదమైనటువంటి అశాంతిని అల్లకల్లాటములను రెచ్చగొట్టటానికి దారి తీస్తున్నది. ఇప్పటికే ప్రతి గ్రామములోనూ, ప్రజలలో కక్షలు, పెద్ద పెద్ద కొట్లాటలు పార్టీలు బయటపడేసినవి. ఇప్పుడు యీ ఎన్నికలు జరిపే పద్ధతినిబట్టి గ్రామాలలో కొట్లాటలకు అవకాశము యిస్తున్నది. యీ ఎన్నికలకు బహిరంగంగా చేతులు ఎత్తే పద్ధతి సామ్యమైన పద్ధతి కాదు. రహస్య ఓటింగు ఉంటేనే ప్రజాశాంతికి రక్షణ యివ్వగలదు. బహిరంగముగా చేతులు ఎత్తే ఓటింగు పద్ధతి పక్షాదు మునివేయించవలసియున్నది. అందువలన యీ ఎన్నికల పద్ధతి సక్రమమైన పద్ధతి అగుకో కాదో గణ్యులందరును, ప్రభుత్వమువారును గుర్తించవలసియున్నది. అందుకనే నేను యీ అవసరమైన adjournment motion ను తెచ్చియున్నాను. గనుక యీ దినము నా తీర్మానము అత్యావసరమైన తీర్మానము తెచ్చియున్నాను. గనుక యీ దినము నా తీర్మానము అత్యావసరమైన తీర్మానము గనుక సభా కార్యక్రమము ఆపుదలచేయించి యీ తీర్మానము చర్చించవలసియున్నది.

[Sri B. Sankarayya] [26th November 1952]

ఇప్పటికే గ్రామాలలో ఎన్నికలు ఆరంభము చేయించారు. ఇకమీదట ఆయనను గ్రామాలలో దెబ్బలాటలు కక్షలు ఆపుదలకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు ప్రయత్నించవలసి యున్నది. ఈ ఎన్నికలు తక్షణం ఆపుదలచేయించి, సక్రమ మార్గములలో ఎన్నికలు జరపనివ్వడం యింకా గ్రామాలలో అనేక కొట్లాటలు జరుగును గనుక నేడు నేను తెచ్చిన తీర్మానమును బలపర్చగలందులకు సభ్యులనందరిని విన్నవించుచు, ప్రభుత్వము వారిని నా తీర్మానమును అంగీకరించవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The hon. the Leader of the Opposition may give a gist of his speech.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“Apart from the gist of his speech which I have not entirely followed, I agree with the hon. Member who has moved this adjournment motion that this relates to a very urgent and definite matter of public importance.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“This matter has already been discussed here.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“This matter has already been raised on the floor of this House only by way of interpellations.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The hon. Member who gave notice of this motion has already raised this point when the District Boards (Amendment) Bill was under discussion in this House and the Hon. Minister replied to that point. Therefore it is not a new thing.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“That matter incidentally arose in connexion with that Bill. The subject-matter of the Bill was only an extension of the life of District Boards. The real question which is now of very urgent public importance is the coming election to panchayats which is going to be conducted under a system of voting by show of hands.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“Is it a new thing?”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“It is a new thing. Originally it was proposed to hold the election by secret ballot. Subsequently it was changed to voting by show of hands, and representations were made in that regard and the attention of the Hon. Minister had been drawn not only by hon. Members from this side of the House but also from the other side. Sir, this voting by show of hands in nearly 7,000 panchayats will lead to great friction and therefore this matter must receive the immediate attention of the Government. We are now only forewarning the Government that if they conduct the elections in this manner, they will be leading to a condition which they can avoid by appropriate action now. That is the urgency and that is the definite matter. It has not been previously discussed. As a substantive thing it has not been discussed, except perhaps some questions were put and some kind of answers were given. We did not bring a non-official motion. There is no Government motion on the Agenda for taking the opinion of the House on this particular matter. I say, in the interests of the people of this State, and in order to allay the

26th November 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

anxieties of hon. Members not only on this side but also on the Government side with regard to this particular matter, the Chair might be pleased to give a ruling that it is entirely in order.

“Also, I would tell the Government that this is a matter on which they can agree to a discussion. After all, the discussion is only for two hours and we might take up this motion at 4 o'clock. I believe, the Hon. the Chief Minister also is not absolutely unaware of the conditions created by the change in the system of voting and a discussion of this kind will certainly be useful. Voting by secret ballot is the very essence of democracy. If this system of voting is changed, it will only lead to friction and breaking of heads almost near polling booths. This is a matter which should immediately arrest our attention and I submit that it is absolutely in order. It is not a vote of censure against the Government.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“It amounts to vote of censure.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“I am not one of those who subscribe to that view.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“Whether the hon. Member subscribes to it or not it is so.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“I submit that an adjournment motion is not always to be treated as a vote of censure. It is for drawing the attention of the Government to a matter of urgent public importance so that it may be possible to arrive at some reasonable understanding by which peace in the State can be maintained, and at the same time the election procedure can be satisfied. Therefore, I submit that it is in order. The Government must not have any rigid view on this matter. Let us have a two-hour discussion and something might emerge. I hope the Hon. the Chief Minister will agree to it.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“If it is the desire of this House and if the Hon. the Chief Minister and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition can come to an understanding, the Government themselves can bring forward a motion of this kind. They can do it.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“That is one of the methods. Sometimes an adjournment motion is the method to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. Once more, at the risk of repetition, I request the Government to accept this motion.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“I want to know the opinion of the Hon. the Chief Minister on this motion.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Sir, I am sorry that an anticipated discussion of this kind as to trouble arising at election time here and there is likely in itself to encourage and produce the result which is sought to be avoided. We have followed a certain policy and issued directions and the election is imminent. If and when trouble arises we had better discuss the question. If beforehand we discuss, the apprehended

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [26th November 1952]

trouble will arise. If we discuss the policy and the policy is not agreed to, then trouble is encouraged. For that reason, I am sorry, I cannot accept the adjournment motion. But, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, my mind is open and we shall look into it when trouble arises and let us not excite trouble now."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I remember a question was put on this subject and I allowed 15 minutes for that question. Again when the District Boards (Amendment) Bill was under discussion the same question was put and the Hon. Minister for Local Administration answered it. In the circumstances, it is not an urgent matter. It has already been discussed in this House in some other form though not in this form. Therefore, I rule this motion out of order."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let me now take up the adjournment motion of Sri Ranga Rao. I am not going to allow the hon. Member to speak on his motion as it is on the same lines as the previous one on which a ruling has been given. The motion reads as follows:—

'This House be adjourned to discuss a specific matter of urgent public importance, namely, the policy of the Government in conducting the elections to the minor panchayats by open show of hands as it will result in the disturbance of the peaceful life of the villages creating increasing bitterness and inimical factions in the villages and as it is *ultra vires* of the fundamental democratic right of free voting given by the Constitution.'

So far as matters relating to elections to minor panchayats are concerned, my ruling with regard to the previous motion holds good for this motion also. As regards the latter portion of the motion, the question whether a particular matter is *ultra vires* of the Constitution has to be decided by the courts."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Some other hon. Members have also given notice of adjournment motions to discuss matters of urgent public importance. I will take them up to-morrow as I have no time to go through them."

IV.—MOTION FOR TRANSACTION OF OFFICIAL BUSINESS ON A NON-OFFICIAL DAY.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Sir, to-morrow Thursday, which is allotted for Non-official Business may be taken up for Official Business and in its stead, the next day, that is 28th November, may be allotted for Non-official Business. I move—

'That rule 24 of the Madras Assembly Rules be suspended and the House do resolve to transact Government business on Thursday, the 27th November 1952.'

26th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—" I do not think there will be any objection to this motion. Instead of transacting Non-official Business on Thursday, it will be done on Friday."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—" Sir, I believe the Cricket Test match between India and Pakistan begins on the 28th November."

MR. SPEAKER:—" Does the hon. Member want that this House should not sit on that day on account of the match? "

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—" The Government have declared 28th and 29th November as holidays in Madras City and the Chingleput district."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—" Only 29th November is a holiday."

SRI M. NARAYANASWAMY :—" ఆధ్యక్ష, point of order ను raise చేస్తున్నాను.

"మీరు సేన పెట్టివస్తుంటే adjournment motion ను తీరస్కరించారు. మీరు రాజ్యాంగ చట్టమువల్ల కలిగినటువంటి సభ్యులయొక్క ప్రాథమిక హక్కువంటి హక్కును మీరు గమనించడములేదు. సభ్యుల హక్కులను సరించి, వారి తీర్మానముల ముఖ్యోద్దేశమును గమనించక, తీరస్కరింప నిష్పత్తి చేసి చివరికి రాత్రి ఆ సే విషయములో తీర్మానమును తెచ్చినను, దానియొక్క అవసరమును గురించిన విచారకంగా తీర్మానము తీరస్కరించటమునేది సరియైన పద్ధతి కాదని నా ఆధిప్తాయమును వెల్లడించుచున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—" The discussion on the motion the hon. Member is referring to is already over. We are now discussing another motion. ' The motion before the House is—

' That rule 24 of the Madras Assembly Rules be suspended and the House do resolve to transact Government business on Thursday, the 27th November 1952.' "

The motion was carried unanimously.

MR. SPEAKER:—" We shall now proceed to the next item in the agenda, namely, the consideration of the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952. I shall take up the Preamble and Clause 1 at the end."

11-50
a.m.

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wanted to say a few words on the previous motion, but before I could do so you put the motion to the vote of the House and passed on to the next item on the agenda."

MR. SPEAKER:—" I have given sufficient time to the House to consider that motion, namely, that instead of Thursday, Friday, will be declared a Non-official day."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" Sir, on that motion I wanted to remind the House that already on a previous occasion a Non-official day was declared to be an Official day. Now it is proposed

[Sri G. Latchanna]

[26th November 1952]

to convert a Non-official day into an Official day. We do not mind which day is allotted for Non-official business, Friday, Monday or Tuesday. We want that the Non-official day which was taken away previously may be given now, and so let us have two days for transaction of Non-official business now."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Instead of discussing this on the floor of the House, let the hon. Member and other Members have a talk with the Hon. the Chief Minister or the Leader of the House and let them inform me of the result?"

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I think we shall have a talk with the Hon. Chief Minister on this matter."

V.—GOVERNMENT BILL

THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAIYAL PROTECTION BILL, 1952
(L.A. BILL NO. 12 OF 1952)—*cont.*

MR. SPEAKER:—"The House will now proceed to the next item on the Agenda, namely, the consideration of the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952. I shall take up the Preamble and Clause 1 at the end."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would submit for your consideration that in this particular Bill, the Preamble itself may be taken up first, because the Preamble governs the entire Bill. The very purpose of this Bill is given in the Preamble. There are certain other things also stated in the Preamble and so I wish we discuss the Preamble and the amendments given notice of thereto first."

MR. SPEAKER:—"There are no amendments to the Preamble."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"There are some amendments given by me to Clause 1 and I want the Preamble and Clause 1 to be taken up first, as they both go together."

MR. SPEAKER:—"They deal with the scope of the Bill and the other provisions deal with the body of the Bill. So we shall discuss the body of the Bill first, and then, in view of the modifications we may make in the body of the Bill the Preamble will have to be modified. So if we are to discuss the Preamble first and then make any modifications in the body of the Bill, no useful purpose will be served by such modifications in the body of the Bill. It is not as if I am shutting out discussion of the Preamble."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, I only submit that the Preamble and Clause 1 should be discussed first, because they go together. Further I have given notice of an amendment to Clause 1. My amendment seeks to make this Bill applicable not only to the district of Tanjore but the entire State. So I submit the consideration of that aspect will not in any way change the consideration of the other clauses of the Bill. Therefore I submit

26th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

we may discuss whether we want the Bill to apply to the entire State or not. That is the sum and substance of my amendment. So I submit the Preamble and Clause 1 may be taken together."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"With due deference to my inexperienced friends, I would like to say that by long and tried experience we have arrived at the convenient practice of considering Bills from Clause 2 onwards first."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Even in England that is the practice."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"But my friend seems to lay stress on one thing, namely, that the Preamble and Clause 1 should be considered together. Nobody objects to it. But we are now proceeding from Clause 2 onwards."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"Sir, I rise on a point of order."

"ఇంతవరకు Speaker గారు ఏ రూలింగు ఇచ్చినప్పటికినీ preambles మొదట తీసుకోవాడని ఎక్కడలేదు. Practice లో మాత్రం మొదట్లో ఆందరు ఆంగ్లకరిస్తే, ఏ క్లాజు అయిననూ తీసుకోవచ్చు. కాని ఇప్పుడు బిల్లులోని క్లాజు లన్నియు ఆంగ్లకరించకుండా మొదట preambles ను తీసుకోవచ్చు. తర్వాతనే బిల్లులోని అంశమును చర్చించవచ్చు. ఇట్టి పద్ధతులలో బిల్లులోని clauses ను చర్చించడము అపి, ముందు preambles తీసుకోవడము నేడు ఒక ప్రత్యేక సమస్యగా తీసుకోవలసిన అవసరం మాత్రం ఒకటి ఉన్నది. అందుకని ఇక్కడ మాత్రంవచ్చే amendments ను ముందు ఆంగ్లకరించినట్లయితే, అసలు బిల్లునే మార్చువలసిన అవసరము ఉంటుంది. అందుచేత ముందు preambles లోని విషయాలు చర్చించిన దానిబట్టి Bill యొక్క clauses మార్పుటకు అవకాశం వుంటుందని నా ఆభిప్రాయము. ఈ బిల్లు ఒక Tanjore జిల్లాకే అన్వయించేటట్లు తెచ్చియన్నారగాని, రాష్ట్రమునంతటికీ అన్వయించజేయు బిల్లును తెచ్చియండలేదు. సభ్యులు బిల్లును అంతయు పరిశీలించుటకు ముందు preambles లోని text, దాని ఉద్దేశ్యమును గ్రహించి బిల్లులో క్లాజులు చర్చించిన వాగుండు నేగాని ముందు clauses తర్వాత preambles అనేది స్పష్టమైన పద్ధతికాదు. ఈ బిల్లు State అంతటకు వర్తింపజేయాలని కోరినను, ప్రభుత్వము మారు majority ఉన్నదనే దృఢముతో ఒక తంజావూరు జిల్లాకే వర్తించేటట్లు చేశింది. అందుకని preambles ను చదివి చర్చించకపోతే, అది సరియైన పద్ధతికాదని చెప్పవచ్చును. మరల బిల్లును అంతయు పరిశీలించుటకు అవసరము లేనప్పుడు . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I fear the hon. Member is repeating what the other hon. Member was saying."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"అందుకని preambles ను చదివి, చర్చించి, ఆమోదమున Bill యొక్క clauses చర్చించిన వాగుంటుందని, యీ విషయము ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు ఆలోచించమని కోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Preamble is more or less like a cap on the head. The hon. Member wants to shape the head according to the cap. (Laughter.) We can only shape the cap according to the head. Clause 2 and the other clauses may be called the head and body of the Bill."

[26th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ There are some tailors who shape the head according to the cap.” (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER:—“ So the House will now take up for consideration Clause 2 of the Bill.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ ఇప్పుడు మీరు యిచ్చినది రూలింగా ? లేక వాత మాటా ? అని అడుగుచున్నాను.”

Clause 2.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The motion is—

‘ That Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.’ ”

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

‘ For sub-clause (d), substitute the following:—

“ ‘ Cultivating tenant ’ or ‘ tenant ’ means a person who lives in the locality and cultivates any land not exceeding 5 acres in extent and belonging to another with his own physical labour or that of the members of his family under a tenancy agreement, express or implied and includes the heirs of such person who are not minors or females competent to cultivate the land.” ’

12 In the alternative, I have also proposed the following amend-
ments to sub-clause (d), viz.,—

‘ (i) In sub-clause (d), after the word “ land ” occurring in line 3, insert the words “ not exceeding 5 acres in extent ”,

and

(ii) Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (d):—

“ Provided they are not females and minors and competent to cultivate the land.” ’

“ Sir, there is also another amendment to sub-clause (f) which, I think, I need not move now.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Before the hon. Member moves his amendments let him read the amendments.”

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—“ The amendment to sub-clause (f) is—

‘ In sub-clause (f), add the following at the end:—

“ and that obtained from the cash crop on punja lands ”.’
These are my amendments to Clause 2.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—“ Sir, I am seconding the amendment and, while doing so, I want to give my views also.”

26th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"I will allow the hon. Member to speak again. The hon. Member, Sri S. Swayamprakasam, has now moved his amendment to sub-clause (d)." Amendment moved—

'For the sub-clause (d), substitute the following:—

" 'Cultivating tenant' or 'tenant' means a person who lives in the locality and cultivates any land not exceeding 5 acres in extent and belonging to another with his own physical labour or that of the members of his family under a tenancy agreement, express or implied and includes the heirs of such person who are not minors or females competent to cultivate the land.' "

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the phrase 'cultivating tenant' which has been introduced in this Bill is capable of different interpretations."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"Sir, on a point of order, as I have moved the amendment, I should have an opportunity to speak on the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I will allow the hon. Member to speak. There are so many amendments and, I think, the amendment given notice of by Sri P. G. Karuthiruman comes first."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Sir, as this is a long clause with so many definitions, I suggest that the definitions may be taken one by one."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The amendment of the hon. Member, Sir P. G. Karuthiruman comes first and then comes the amendment of hon. Member, Sri S. Swayamprakasam. Sri P. G. Karuthiruman will therefore please move his amendment."

*** SRI P. G. KARUTHIRUMAN:**—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

'That the following be added as additional sub-clause (aa):—

"(aa) A catch crop is any secondary crop grown when the cultivation of the main crop is not possible and includes pulses but does not include cotton.' "

The amendment was duly seconded.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"Sir, it has not yet been circulated."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"It is being circulated."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendment moved—

'That the following be added as additional sub-clause (aa):—

"(aa) A catch crop is any secondary crop grown when the cultivation of the main crop is not possible and includes pulses but does not include cotton.' "

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, I just want to know whether leguminous crops also come in as catch crops under this definition."

[26th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Pulses are leguminous crops."

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—"A catch crop may be anything except cotton."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I wish to know the attitude of the Government towards this amendment. Are they accepting it?"

*** THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:**—"It is not necessary but I was wondering whether any light would be thrown by hon. Members who are suspicious. But, if there is no suspicion, I would rather not have it because I do not see what is the object of the amendment. Anyhow, if the hon. Gentlemen opposite have any information, I would like to hear them."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I should think that this amendment is wholly unnecessary."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I want to know whether the hon. Member, Sri P. G. Karuthiruman, is withdrawing his amendment."

SRI P. G. KARUTHIRUMAN:—"Sir, I withdraw the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I hope the House gives him permission to withdraw the amendment."

The amendment was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member, Sri S. Swayamprakasam, will now speak on his amendment."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"Sir, I have moved that the following definition of 'cultivating tenant' or 'tenant' be substituted for sub-clause (d) of Clause (2):—

" 'Cultivating tenant' or 'tenant' means a person who lives in the locality and cultivates any land not exceeding 5 acres in extent and belonging to another with his own physical labour or that of the members of his family under a tenancy agreement, express or implied and includes the heirs of such person who are not minors or females competent to cultivate the land."

As I said before, this definition is a very important one as the operation and working of this Act will wholly depend upon this definition of the 'cultivating tenant'. The question whether the definition of 'cultivating tenant' includes middlemen or intermediaries is an important one which has got to be tackled. Yesterday, when the Hon. the Chief Minister by way of a personal explanation intervened in the debate, he asked whether my attitude was one of supporting the claims of middlemen or whether it was one of exclusion of middlemen once and for all. My attitude is that when a new legislation is brought into existence the rights and liabilities of various parties are affected. While the rights and liabilities of the various parties concerned should not be adversely affected, each party should, at the same time, be definite about its position when the new legislation is brought

26th November 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

into force. That is my object. In the district of Tanjore to which this Act is applicable, in the first instance, we have got mirasdar land-owners and also lessee middlemen or intermediaries. Then we come to the tenants, pannaiyals and casual labourers who are actually on the soil. These are the people that are affected by this piece of legislation. What their rights and liabilities are should be determined and there should not be any doubt in any part of the Act in regard to these rights. If we say that the middle men are not to be excluded, we must have a certain provision in the Act as regards the relationship between the middlemen and landowners with whom they have entered into a contract. If we say that their rights and liabilities are abolished, my attitude will be quite different. Again, the rights and liabilities of the actual tiller of the soil under the middlemen have got to be determined. Therefore my attitude as a legislator is, that there should not be any doubt in the various sections of the Act. Yesterday, the Hon. Chief Minister said that while I was pleading for relief for the tiller of the soil, I was also pleading for the middlemen, as if I was inconsistent in my argument. Certainly not. My argument is that the rights and liabilities of all the parties should be determined without the least shadow of a doubt. The mirasdars should not be under the impression that a particular section gives them relief, while as a matter of fact, the legislation has no intention of giving them such relief. When we are passing a new legislation, we must think over the matter and see that there are no loopholes. My learned friend, Sri K. Varadachari, said that loopholes were common in any legislation. I am sorry that even the Hon. the Minister for Revenue said in his reply to the general debate on this Bill that it was common to find loopholes in all the Bills. This is not the stage when we should talk about loopholes. It is just like saying that it is our fate. If we try to achieve a certain objective and fail in our attempt, we should then only say that it is our fate and not before even making an attempt to achieve a particular objective. So also, when we are making a new legislation, we should not allow loopholes as far as possible. When certain loopholes are brought to the notice of the Legislature, is it not our duty to remove them? When we are talking about certain definitions and the different interpretations that can be put on them, we should not talk about loopholes because it will be taken advantage of by others. This is exactly the reason for my saying that as far as possible there should be no loopholes. Though the Hon. the Chief Minister remarked that the cat was out of the bag, it was really out to find a rat.

“ These loopholes are there. My intention is definitely to see that there is not more than one particular interpretation for a particular section. The original definition of ‘ cultivating tenant ’ was as follows:—

“ ‘ cultivating ‘ tenant ’ or ‘ tenant ’ means a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of his family in the cultivation of any land belonging another, under a tenancy agreement, express or implied, and includes the heirs to of such person.’ ”

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [26th November 1952]

The word 'contributes' is a very big term. As I said before, even a person writing a letter from Madras or sending word or once in a way going to the place where his lands are situated and supervising the agricultural operations will satisfy the word 'contributes'. The word 'contributes' is a very wide term which may bring in middlemen. There are people in the district of Tanjore who belong to other districts, e.g., Tirunelveli, Ramana-thapuram, Salem, etc. They have come to Tanjore and have taken large extents of land—four hundred and five hundred acres. Periodically they go to Tanjore district and supervise the agricultural operations in their lands, namely, whether all the lands have been cultivated by the villagers of the soil, whether the lands have been properly manured and irrigated, etc. The Chief Minister said that because of my request the word 'physical' had been substituted for the word 'personal'. Merely going about and supervising the lands and looking after the work of pannaiyal or casual cultivator will satisfy the term 'contribute.' A person may very well contend, 'I am a lessee, even though I reside in Madras. I have got so many men on the soil. I contribute my physical labour by going round and supervising the cultivation of my lands. I must be classed as a "cultivating tenant".' As it is, the definition is capable of such interpretation. That is the reason why I am putting it that a cultivating tenant means 'a person who lives in the locality and cultivates any land . . .'. The extent of the land to be cultivated by a cultivating tenant must also be fixed. If, as I said before, a particular middleman is able to convince the Revenue Court that he should be recognized as a 'cultivating tenant,' the question which arises next is, for how many acres—400 or 500 acres of land—he is a cultivating tenant. The hon. Members may imagine how many people must be there on the soil, and what their liabilities and assets should be. A pannaiyal cannot cultivate more than 6-2/3 acres according to the schedule attached to the Bill. When the Government have fixed a limit for a pannaiyal for cultivation purposes, why should they not fix a limit for a 'cultivating tenant'? The whole object of the Bill is defeated if this is not done. The successful working of this Act depends upon the definition of the term 'cultivating tenant.' Yesterday the Hon. the Chief Minister was pleased to say that I must come forward with an alternative suggestion. Though the Legal Department is there, yet I was asked to put forth my suggestion. Further, sufficient time was not given to me. That is why I have to fix the limit 'not exceeding 5 acres in extent' in a hurry.

"Again according to the definition of the words 'cultivating tenant' in the Bill, 'cultivating tenant' means 'a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of the members of his family in the cultivation of any land belonging to another, under a tenancy agreement, express or implied, and includes the heirs of such person.

26th November 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

“ The ‘ heirs ’ may be persons who may not be willing or competent to cultivate the land. Our object must be that the total production from land should not be affected badly as a result of this Bill being passed into law. Suppose a tenant dies in the middle of a cultivating season leaving behind him minor girls or sons who may not be competent to satisfy the definition of ‘ cultivating tenant ’ ; or he may leave behind him a major son who may not be willing to cultivate or who may like to pursue other avocations in Simla or New Delhi. Why should the Government saddle him with the rights and responsibilities of a ‘ cultivating tenant ’ ? This is the reason why I have provided in my amendment, relating to the definition of ‘ the cultivating tenant ’ , ‘ . . . and includes the heirs of such person who are not minors or females competent to cultivate the land. ’ I have to include these things in the definition of the cultivating tenant with a view to see that the objects of the Bill are properly carried out. Sir, I hope there will be no difficulty in accepting my amendment to sub-clause (d) of Clause 2.”

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am seconding the amendment which has been ably moved by my hon. Friend Sri Swayamprakasam. I have not much to add to what he has stated because all the points involved in the amendment have been exhausted by him. I feel that the object of the Bill is to eliminate the intermediaries like middlemen who do not own lands but still get the benefit from the lands through some tillers. If this was the object, the term ‘ cultivating tenant ’ must be specifically defined so as to eliminate tenants who profit from the labours put in by pannaityals and others. There are many educated men coming from Tanjore district who do not actually contribute by their own physical labour to the production of food, but who work in offices like the Madras Secretariat or the New Delhi Secretariat. Even though they are far away from these lands in the district of Tanjore, still they would come under the definition of the term ‘ cultivating tenant ’ , because they go periodically once in a year to these lands and see whether they are properly irrigated and manured. That is the reason why we insist that the definition of the ‘ cultivating tenant ’ should be properly amended to eliminate middlemen.

“ Secondly, according to the definition of the ‘ cultivating tenant ’ in the Bill, it includes ‘ the heirs of such person ’ . Our fear is that this kind of cultivating tenancy should not be prolonged for too long. It would not be possible in all cases to insist upon the heirs of a cultivating tenant being made responsible for the liabilities and assets of the deceased cultivating tenant. A minor girl who happens to be the heir will not be in a position to execute the terms of tenancy. But the liability if any left by the deceased tenant will be forced upon her. For no fault of hers she will be forced to bear the responsibility of the

[Sri K. Vinayakam] [26th November 1952]

deceased tenant. Let us not create a situation whereby the heirs of a cultivating tenant who happen to be educated men and who are trying to take to different avocations like Government service would be made to bear the liability left by the deceased cultivating tenant. We are introducing this amendment only to see that middlemen are completely eliminated from the scope of this Act."

12-20
P.m.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, I think there is a certain amount of confusion with regard to the actual position. Sub-clause (d) of clause 2 defines 'cultivating tenant' or 'tenant' as a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of the members of his family in the cultivation of any land belonging, etc. Here the tenant is defined as one who contributes his own physical labour or that of the members of his family. Now, if you try to limit the extent of land that he can take out on lease or varam or kuthagai, it will lead to an anomalous position. For example, there might be a large family consisting of half-a-dozen members, and all of them will be able to contribute their physical labour. If the amendment of Mr. Swayamprakasam is accepted, it will lead to a position where the entire family can take on varam, kuthagai or contract only a total extent of 5 acres of land and nothing more. I therefore think that Mr. Swayamprakasam has some other thing in view and unfortunately that thing cannot be fitted into the definition clause."

(Sri S. Swayamprakasam rose.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"Order, order, the hon. Member has got a right of reply later on."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I think, as I said, Mr. Swayamprakasam has got something else in view, and unfortunately if that is sought to be put in this clause it will lead to an anomalous position, and large families will not be able to take the extent of land which they can normally cultivate with the labour available in their own family. That sort of affairs should be prevented. In the definition of 'tenant' there is no limitation of the total extent of land a tenant can take, and the only limitation by which he is bound is the total amount of physical labour that is available to him either of his own or the members of his family. That limitation is already there. Therefore, I think, it is unnecessary to think of putting in any further limitation. The purpose which Mr. Swayamprakasam has in view will be served by moving some other amendment, that is, with regard to middlemen which will come later. I would therefore now request him not to press his amendment."

* SRI Y. V. KRISHNA RAO:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have given notice of an amendment to clause 6, but the subject-matter under discussion is very similar to that of my amendment, and therefore I would like, with your permission, to say a few words on this occasion. One of the objects of the Bill is to improve

26th November 1952] [Sri Y. V. Krishna Rao]

the relationship between the landlord and the tenant and the other and a more important objective aimed at is the improvement of food production, because though we are pre-eminently an agricultural country, we are suffering from acute food shortage. No legislation that does not aim at the improvement of food production in the State is worth its name. The improvement in, or the stepping up of, food production is the main objective of all modern legislation. Concentration of large extents of land does not conduce to proper food production. With this in view the sponsors of the Bill rightly feel that a ceiling limit or an upper limit is necessary in the case of a land-owner for personal cultivation. But, that is not done in the case of a tenant. Under the present arrangement, while the extent of land for a landlord is fixed, the tenant's extent is not fixed. This is unwise and also unjust, unwise because if it is an evil to keep an extent of more than 6-2/3 acres of land in the hands of a landlord it is equally, if not more, dangerous to put more acres of land in the hands of the tenant; and the result is, food production suffers. If what is aimed at in the Bill is only a sentimental satisfaction that the big land-holder is expropriated, I have nothing to say. On the other hand, if the object is to increase food production, I think, my submission is that the ceiling, for the extent of land that a tenant could lay his hand on, should be fixed at a level not higher than 6-2/3 acres. Otherwise, it neither serves the interests of social justice nor does it serve to promote food production."

* SRI G. NARAYANASWAMI NAIDU :—"கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே, நண்பர் சுவயம்பரசாசம் அவர்களையே நோக்கம் நல்லதாக இருந்தாலும் கூட அவருடைய திருத்தமானது பல புதிய தொந்தரவுகளை உண்டாக்கும் என்று நான் கருதுகிறேன். ஒரு குடும்பத்தார் எவ்வளவு ஏக்கர் நிலம் சாகுபடி செய்ய முடியும் என்பதைப்பற்றி அந்தக் குடும்பத் தலைவருடைய பலம், அநுபவம், அந்தக் குடும்பத்தின் சாகுபடி திறமை எல்லாவற்றையும் பொறுத்திருக்கிறது. பெரிய குடும்பத்தின் தலைவரை இருக்கப்பட்டவன் வைத்தடைந்து போகலாம் அல்லது வேறு ஊருக்குச் சென்றுவிடலாம். அப்படிச் சென்றுவிட்டால் சாகுபடி செய்யும் நிலத்தின் அளவு குறைந்து போய் விடும். அவருடைய நோக்கம் இடையீட்டுக்காரனை ஒழிக்க வேண்டுமென்றால் இந்தத் திருத்தம் பொருத்தமானது அல்ல, நியாயமானதும் அல்ல. ஒரு ஏக்கர் நிலத்தை வைத்தக்கொண்டு இருக்கும் ஒரு உழவன் அந்த ஒரு ஏக்கரை வைத்துக் கொண்டு அவனுடைய வாழ்க்கையை பூராவும் நடத்த முடியாது. அவன் நான்கு ஏக்கர்கள் குத்தகைக்கு வாங்கி பயிரிட்டு வந்தால்தான் அவனால் தன்னுடைய குடும்பத்தை நடத்த முடியும். அவனை இடையீட்டுக்காரன் என்று ஒத்துக்கொள்ள முடியாது. அவன் ஐந்து ஏக்கர்கள் வைத்திருந்தால்தான் அவனால் ஏர் வைத்து மாடுகள் வைத்து குடும்பத்தை நடத்த முடியும். வேறு ஜில்லாக்களிலிருந்து வந்து ஏராளமான கைப்பணத்தைப் போட்டு நிலங்களை குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்து இடையில் இருந்து கொண்டு ஏராளமான லாபம் சம்பாதிக்கின்றவர்கள்தான் இடையீட்டுக்காரர்கள். அதற்கு பதிலாக குறைந்த அளவில் நிலத்தை வைத்துக்கொண்டிருந்தால் இந்த தொந்தரவுகள் இருக்காது. அப்படி இல்லா விட்டால் ஏராளமான நிலத்தை குத்தகைக்கு எடுக்கும் நிலைமை வரும். எவ்வளவு நிலம் ஒருவன் வைத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்று மதிப்பிட்டால் இந்த திருத்தத்திற்கே வழி இல்லை. இந்த திருத்தத்தினால் குழப்பம் தான் உண்டாகும் என்று நான் கருதுகிறேன். சமீபத்தில் சவாயி சங்கராச்சாரியார் கூட ஒரு திட்டம் வகுத்திருக்கிறார். ஐந்து ஏக்கர் நிலம் வைத்துக்கொண்டு தானே சொந்தமாக விவசாயம் செய்ய வேண்டும்

[Sri G. Narayanaswami Naidu] [26th November 1952]

என்றும், அப்படி வைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறவர்கள்தான் தனக்கு பிட்சையிட வேண்டும் என்றும், அப்படி பிட்சை இட்டால்தான் தான் ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளமுடியும் என்றும் அவர் மாயூரத்திலிருந்து ஒரு ஸ்ரீமுகம் விடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்பதாக நான் அறிகிறேன். இவ்வளவு நிலம் வைத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்று சட்டம் செய்து விட்டால் இப்படிப்பட்ட இடையீட்டுக்காரர்கள் தானாகவே ஒழிந்துபோய் விடுவார்கள் என்பதை தெரிவித்துக்கொண்டும் கனம் சுவாமப்பரகாசம் நல்ல நோக்கத்துடன் இந்த தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்த போதிலும் அது காரியத்தில் சாத்யமில்லாமல் போய் விபரீதம் விளைவிக்கும் என்பதாக நான் கருதுவதால் அதை எதிர்க்கிறேன்.”

* SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN:—“Sir, I too oppose this amendment. The reasons have been stated by the two previous speakers. Apart from those reasons, I have also my doubt with regard to the last line of the amendment. According to the amendment, I wish to know what would happen to a family consisting of a lady and two minor children? Suppose the husband has been a tenant under a contract for five years. If the husband dies after the first year the poor wife with two minor children is left alone. According to this amendment that lady, with the minor children, is precluded from carrying on the cultivation of the land contracted for by the husband. If this amendment is adopted and given effect to, the lady with the two minor children will be thrown on the streets, and what is the safeguard which my Friend proposes for such cases?”

12-30
p.m.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“Sir, I only want to say that some provision must be made to safeguard the interests of the minors and the widow who survive the tenant during the term of the tenancy. If the Government were to accept the amendment of Sri Swayamprakasam, I think the Hon. the Chief Minister will make a provision for safeguarding their interests.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Sir, only if we accept the amendment, all these difficulties arise and we have to make provision to safeguard the interests of minors and widows. Mr. Swayamprakasam was a party to preparing this draft in the Select Committee and so I can understand his object. I think that the way in which he tries to achieve his object will lead to further difficulties, some of which we can foresee now and the others we cannot. So I suggest that he does not press his amendment. The substitution of the word ‘cultivates’ for the word ‘contributes’ will only lead to more ambiguity instead of removing ambiguity. I submit that the words ‘contributes his own physical labour or that of the members of his family in the cultivation of any land’ are the most suitable words that we can discover for the purpose we have in view. If Mr. Swayamprakasam agrees, I propose to add at the end of sub-clause (d), the following to meet his object:

‘but shall not include a mere intermediary or his heirs’. This addition will give a clear indication to the courts as to what we mean.”

26th November 1952]

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"Sir, Mr. Ramamurthi said in the course of his speech that I had something else in my mind. Let him rest assured that I have nothing else in my mind except what I say on the floor of this House, viz., that the wording of the clauses must be clear and unambiguous and must not be capable of more than one interpretation.

"In opposing my amendment, he objected to the limitation of the holding of a tenant to five acres. I do not object to a family having as many five acres as there are number of members in it. Even a middleman may say that he has 'contributed' towards the cultivation of the land by his periodical supervision, and the Revenue Courts may hold that he comes within the definition of a cultivating tenant. That is my difficulty. It is better to define the word 'intermediary'. In the absence of such a definition, I press my amendment."

SRI P. S. KRISHNASWAMI AYYANGAR:—"Sir, a land-owner might have mortgaged the usufructuary rights on his land and taken back the land on lease as a tenant from the mortgagee. In that case, the owner of the land happens to be the tenant himself. If any clarification is needed in respect of such lands, it may be made."

* **THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI**:—"Sir, let us take the points one by one and clear our minds. The first point is about the choice between the words existing in the Bill 'contributes his own physical labour . . . in the cultivation of any land' and the words proposed in the amendment 'cultivates any land . . . with his own physical labour'. I submit with all respect to Mr. Swayamprakasam that he should not be obsessed with the present idea. Let him look at the question objectively. The proposed wording does not improve the position. I propose to add at the end the words 'but shall not include a mere intermediary or his heirs'."

"The second point is about the inclusion of 'heirs'. All of us, especially the Members belonging to the Opposition, bestowed a great deal of thought on this issue in the Select Committee. They agreed with me that to exclude heirs would lead to injustice. We do want to give protection to minor or female heirs of a deceased tenant. Therefore we need not spend any more time on this point. I would ask Mr. Swayamprakasam to accept my assurance that the definition with the amendment that I have suggested will satisfy all that he wants."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"If the Government define the word 'intermediary' properly, I have no objection to withdraw my amendment."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"We cannot go on defining all the words in the Definitions clause. The courts will have to be guided by the general dictionary meaning."

[26th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is--

For sub-clause (d), substitute the following:

"Cultivating tenant" or "tenant" means a person who lives in the locality and cultivates any land not exceeding 5 acres in extent and belonging to another with his own physical labour or that of the members of his family under a tenancy agreement, express or implied, and includes the heirs of such person who are not minors or females competent to cultivate the land."

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—"Mr. Swayamprakasam has given an alternative amendment. After that is disposed of, I will take up the Government amendment."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"Sir, I move—

(i) *in sub-clause (d), after the word "land" occurring in line 3, insert the words "not exceeding 5 acres in extent."*

(ii) *Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (d): "Provided they are not females and minors and competent to cultivate the land." "*

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Sir, I second the amendment. If the Government do not agree to the limitation of five acres, we do not mind if any other limitation is put in."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Motion moved—

(i) *In sub-clause (d) after the word "land" occurring in line 3, insert the words "not exceeding 5 acres in extent."*

(ii) *Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (d): "Provided they are not females and minors and competent to cultivate the land." "*

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, the idea with which the hon. Member moved the amendment is very laudable. But I believe that if we limit the holding of a tenant to five acres, it will be very uneconomical for him. In my part of the country, tenants take wet lands from one landlord, a little garden land from another landlord and some dry land from yet another landlord and the total holding of a tenant may exceed five acres. A family cannot live on a small extent of five acres. If the hon. Member proposed 25 or 50 acres, it would have been a different thing and we could have discussed the matter. Since he has proposed five acres, I submit it is very uneconomical and I want him to reconsider the position."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"If, for instance, twenty acres is put in, it will mislead the Courts, because physical labour for twenty acres would be meaningless. It will be the beginning to include intermediaries. Therefore it is better to have the clause clear."

26th November 1952]

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—" I do not mind increasing the extent. My idea was five acres for each member of a tenant's family."

MR. SPEAKER:—" Are the Government accepting the amendment? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—" No, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—" The question is—

(i) In sub-clause (d), after the word " land " occurring in line 3, insert the words " not exceeding 5 acres in extent."

(ii) Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (d):—

" Provided they are not females and minors and competent to cultivate the land." "

The amendment was lost.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" Sir, I move the following amendment, namely:—

' Add at the end of Clause (d) the following, namely—

' but shall not include a mere intermediary or his heirs.' "

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—" Sir, the intermediary may include in such cases, as my learned friend on the other side knows, different persons. There may be a mortgagee, there may be a matadhipathi, and there may be other persons. So many persons will come under the term ' intermediary ', and the Court will find it difficult to decide who is the intermediary unless the term ' intermediary ' is defined. If the term ' intermediary ' is defined, I accept the amendment. Otherwise I oppose it."

12 40
p.m.

MR. SPEAKER:—" The question is—

' Add at the end of Clause 2 (d) the following, namely:—

" but shall not include a mere intermediary or his heirs " ' .

The amendment was carried.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—" I move the following amendment, namely,—

' In sub-clause (f) add the following at the end, namely:—

" and that obtained from the cash crop on punja lands ' ."

" Sir, sub-clause (f) reads as follows:—

" " Gross produce " includes the yield obtained at the poradi. " Poradi " is a peculiar term applicable only to paddy cultivation. First there will be the first threshing, and then will follow the poradi. There will be produce both from the first threshing and second threshing that is, poradi. So, poradi is confined to only paddy cultivation. But the object of the Bill is not that. The object of the Bill is to see that the produce obtained from any other crop is also included in the gross produce. Therefore, in order to implement the provisions contained in other Clauses of the Bill, I am seeking to include other crops also in the gross produce. As it is, the definition of gross produce may mean

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [26th November 1952]

only the produce obtained from paddy cultivation, because *poradi* has application only to paddy cultivation. It will not include any other crop. Other crops have been included in the other Clauses of the Bill. Only to implement them, I am moving my amendment, which is only consequential."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is it a consequential amendment?"

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"I am putting it as a consequential amendment. I think it will not be difficult for the Government to accept the amendment."

The amendment was duly seconded.

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, I would deprecate merely going on adding to the sub-clause. We have not defined 'gross produce'. We have only stated that it should include something. It is unnecessary to go on defining it further by including in it further things. It will create more difficulty than, simplification."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"Let me explain the position. There are two processes in getting yield from paddy cultivation. As soon as the harvest takes place, there is the first threshing. This is the first process. The second process is the second threshing, which is *poradi*. The term '*poradi*' applies only to paddy cultivation. It may be argued later that it does not include any other crop. To make the position clear, I have brought forward this amendment. Hon. Members need not think that I have any other object in view."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, the hon. Member does not make the position clear. '*Poradi*' is peculiar to paddy cultivation. There are two gatherings, namely, (1) as soon as the harvest is over, that is, the first threshing and (2) the *poradi* after the first threshing. It is only to clear the doubt in regard to paddy, it is stated that gross produce includes the yield obtained at the *poradi*. So, I oppose the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'In sub-clause (f) add the following at the end, namely,—
"and that obtained from the cash crop on punja lands".'

The amendment was lost.

Clause 2, as amended, was put and carried.

Clause 3.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, I move the amendment standing in my name, namely,—

'Omit sub-clause (b).'

"Sub-clause (b) states that the provisions of this Act shall not apply in respect of the land held by a landowner in any village if the land held by him in such village does not exceed one veli

26th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

(6 2/3 acres) which is either wet land or dry land irrigated from any Government source or three velis (twenty acres) of dry land not irrigated from any Government source. My amendment seeks to delete this provision and make the Act applicable to all land-owners whether they give the land either on rent or on lease or they take to pannaï cultivation. As it is, the Bill seeks to make an invidious distinction between tenants who work under landlords possessing more than one veli (6-2/3 acres) and those who work under others who own one veli and less. This invidious distinction will not work in actual practice. In one and the same village there will be tenants who do the same work and who contribute the same amount of labour, but the mere fact that they happen to be working under landlords who do not own more than one veli, will make them work on less favourable terms of service than those obtaining in the case of tenants who work under landlords owning more than one veli. Tenants working under landlords owning one veli and less will be subject, therefore, to eviction at any time by the landlords. The object of the Bill to give protection to people who are working as tenants or as pannaiyals will be defeated by giving exemption to that large class of people owning one veli and less. Of course it is sought to be made out that people owning one veli and less are poor people, and are people who do not make much out of their land, and that, therefore, in their case, a certain amount of exemption should be provided. But my submission is that we are not concerned with the question whether or not a particular person has got 6-2/3 acres of land or more. We are now concerned with the kind of exploitation that is going on. The landlord owns the land but does not work on the land. Nobody wants to prevent a person who to-day, for example, owns less than 6-2/3 acres of land, from resuming personal cultivation at any time if he chooses to do so. I would be prepared to allow that. If there are persons who own less than 6-2/3 acres of land and if at any time they want to resume personal cultivation, in such cases they may certainly get the preference and the tenant who may be on the land may even be sent out. But so long as there is a system of tenancy, that is, so long as a landlord carries on cultivation under the pannaiyal system, then that pannaiyal must be entitled to the protection which his brother pannaiyals are entitled to under the Bill. Otherwise, there will be innumerable disputes taking place in village after village. As a matter of fact, already in the Tanjore district in a number of villages, there have been disputes and very grave disputes at that, after the promulgation of the Ordinance, between small mirasdars and their pannaiyals, and small mirasdars and their waramdars. Really, in practice, it will be impossible to make them conform to any lower rates, because the peasants will fight. Why should we unnecessarily encourage this fight? Instead of that, let us see to it that everybody gets a square deal. On that basis, I would press this amendment not to give exemption to anybody."

12-59
p.m.

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is any hon. Member seconding the amendment?"

[26th November 1952]

SRI C. KANDASAMI:—"I second the amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendment moved—

'Omit sub-clause (b)'.

"Now, I must tell the House that as soon as an amendment is moved, it should be seconded. If it is not seconded, the amendment will fall through."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"Sir, I have given notice of an amendment to clause 3."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I shall call the hon. Members to move their amendments according to the order in which I am going to take them up. The hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi has given notice of an alternative amendment. As soon as the present amendment is disposed of, I am going to take up the alternative amendment. Then, hon. Members Sri Samia Koorayar and Sri Bapanayya have given notice of amendments similar to that of Sri Ramamurthi. They will be taken up. Then comes the amendment of the hon. Member Sri Rajagopala Rao. After that comes the amendment of the hon. Member Sri Swayamparakasam."

"Now, I want to know what the Government want to say on the present amendment."

SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM:—"Sir, I have also given notice of an amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"It will be taken up later."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, as regards procedure, I want to know one thing. To clause 3 there are quite a number of amendments covering different subjects. Now, is it the intention that the discussion should be on all the amendments together or separately?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendments will be taken up one after another."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Now, with regard to this amendment, the idea is, apart from the language, to extend the Bill at once to even small holdings. That is the proposal contained in this amendment. I submit that that would be very inadvisable as a matter of general policy. We have now a certain number of applications to be disposed of, petitions regarding evictions to be disposed of, and disputes to be settled, and we have limited them to a certain extent now by providing that holdings of the size of 6-2/3 acres will not be covered by this legislation. If we all at once begin with the whole of the lands in the Tanjore district, the difficulty will be far too great and we shall not be able to proceed properly and effectively. I would therefore, submit with all respect that this amendment should not be pressed."

26th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

“ The hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi appeared to me to give away the whole case when he said that, if the owner wished to take for personal cultivation the land which comprised less than 6-2/3 acres, he would have no objection. Now it means this. If we provide all this complicated machinery for the land in the first instance and then say that the owner may take it away, we take away really what we give in the first instance, and we would have to pass a new law, so to say, to cover such cases, where he will be bound by all these provisions in the first instance, but yet the over-riding claim of the owner will cancel the whole thing. I think it would not be proper to create this confusion just now. I would advise and request hon. Members on the other side not to press this amendment for this reason that ultimately the policy which is embodied in this Bill, will certainly have its influence on the general custom and privileges that will be claimed and enjoyed by landowners as well as tenants even in respect of the smaller holdings. It will operate by influence in course of time. Let us allow that natural operation to take place, and then let us enter, if there is necessity, by legislation. Otherwise, it would be really starting immediately a difficulty throughout the length and breadth of the district. If we allow the natural operation to take place, then the natural instinct of the people will be to claim what is enjoyed by the neighbour. Let them claim and let them get it. I assure hon. Members, who are doubtful about the effect of it, that they need not have doubts, because the tenant will have a great deal of moral strength behind him when he makes the claim and he will get it without difficulty and agreement will begin to prevail in spite of rules and regulations in force.

“ Let us take also the procedure that is to be followed in giving effect to the provisions of this Bill. It involves a certain amount of litigation of one kind or another. Let us not put the whole of the Tanjore district into litigation. Let us proceed first with this small limit. If the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi is willing to allow the owner to take over the 6-2/3 acres of land, why should we not allow him to choose his own tenant, for the time being, if there is such a tenant? And all this difficulty of finding out whether he is a tenant or whether he is an owner or whether he is an intermediary, will be soluble in the case of the bigger holdings and insoluble in the case of the smaller holdings. These and many other reasons which I need not go into, induce me to say that we cannot accept the amendment, and I would go further and ask hon. Members on the other side not to press it.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Sir, after hearing the reply of the Hon. the Chief Minister, I must say that I am not convinced, because the only reason that he has adduced against the acceptance of this amendment is an administrative one. He does not say that the tenants under the small landholders should not get whatever protection is afforded to the tenants under this Bill, but says that in view of the administrative difficulty this amendment may lead to, it should not be accepted. I would submit that

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [26th November 1952]

administrative difficulties should not come in the way of affording protection to the tenants irrespective of under whom they are actually working to-day as tenants.

"Secondly, the main thing with which we are concerned, is the question of share that the tenants will get under this Bill. If a certain class of people are excluded from the operation of this Bill, then what would happen? Just now when I was coming to the Assembly, some people from certain parts of Tanjore came to me and told me that the smaller landholders had actually started giving less than what they were even previously giving, under the plea that the law allows them exemption. Therefore, the share that the tenants will get will be further reduced. Now, irrespective of the question of litigation, not exempting any kind of landholders, which means that everybody will get a certain share of the crop, is the biggest thing that is absolutely essential. Therefore, I press my amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Has the Hon. the Revenue Minister anything to say on this matter?"

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I have only to repeat the arguments advanced by the Hon. the Chief Minister that there is not only the administrative difficulty but other ones also. There must be a certain extent of land in which the owner can operate. There may be some circumstances in which he can himself take the plough and cultivate the land. After all, we have limited the area to a very small extent and there must be that much of freedom, so that any gentleman, whether he is the owner or a tenant, may cultivate his own land. I cannot see my way to accept the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'Omit sub-clause (b).'

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi wants in his alternative amendment to omit certain words and substitute certain other words. So, I would call the hon. Member Sri Swayamprakasam to move his amendment now."

1 p.m. SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"Sir, I move the following amendment standing in my name:—

'Omit the words "in any village" and "in such village" occurring in lines 2 and 3 of sub-clause (b).'

"While moving the amendment, I wish to say a few words. Sub-clause (b) of clause 3 says that the provisions of this Act 'shall not apply in respect of the land held by a landowner in any village if the land held by him in such village does not exceed one veli (6-2/3 acres) which is either wet land or dry land irrigated from any Government source, or three velis (twenty acres) of dry land not irrigated from any Government source.' My amendment is

26th November 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

for the deletion of the words 'in any village' and 'in such village' occurring in this clause. If a tenant is cultivating a land of a landowner who has less than one veli, say by 5 cents or 8 cents in a particular village, according to this sub-clause, he will be put to difficulty. He will not be able to reap the benefits of this Act. There are many landowners who have lands in different villages. I mean, in different contiguous villages. They may by accident possess less than a veli in a particular village. In such cases, the Act will not give relief to a tenant who is working on the spot simply because the landowner does not have more than 6-2/3 acres of land in that particular village. A tenant who has accidentally to be in a village in which the landowner does not possess more than a veli, should not be deprived of the benefits of this Act. That is the point which I wish to stress. The tenant should be given adequate relief in such cases. It is for this purpose only I have moved my amendment and request the House to accept the same."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to second the amendment moved by the hon. Member Sri Swayamprakasam. While doing so, I wish to point out that the amendment standing in my name and the one standing in the name of Sri Vadivelu are more or less the same as the one just now moved by Sri Swayamprakasam."

MR. SPEAKER:—"No, the hon. Member's amendment contains something more."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"But, the effect of both the amendments is the same. So it is immaterial if my amendment is accepted or not."

MR. SPEAKER:—"In that case, let not the hon. Member move his amendment."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, the main question is, who are the people who have got to be exempted and whether it is right to exempt landlords owning less than 6-2/3 acres of land from the operation of this Act. Why should we restrict the extent of the land to one veli? As a matter of fact, there are landlords who own hundreds of acres. Their lands may be situated in a number of villages. I can give concrete instances—and I do not want to mention names here—in which landlords, who own more than 200 velis in different villages, possess less than 5 acres of land in a particular village. Why should the tenants working under such a landlord in that particular village where he owns less than 5 acres of land, be placed at a great disadvantage? Therefore it is we urge that in such cases the landlord should not be exempted from the operation of this Act. In such cases, the extent of the land possessed by the landlord in a particular village should not be taken into account, but the total extent of the land that he possesses in various villages should also be taken as a single unit for purposes of this sub-clause. This amendment is meant only

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [26th November 1952]

to help the poor tenants. Therefore I don't think the Chief Minister or the Government will have any difficulty whatsoever in accepting this amendment. This is a simple proposition. If the amendment is accepted in principle, then we can certainly look into the wording carefully."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendment moved—

'Omit the words "in any village" and "in such village" occurring in lines 2 and 3 of sub-clause (b).'

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"ఈ సమస్య మీద రామమూర్తిగారు మాట్లాడు కూడండగా అటువైపు ఉన్న ట్టువంటి మంత్రులలో ఏదో ఒక విధమైన అభిప్రాయాలు యీ భూముల విషయములో సూచించుచున్నట్లునూ, opposition వారు కాలయాపనకు దారితీస్తున్నారని అభిప్రాయపడుతున్నట్లు నేను అభిప్రాయపడుతున్నాను. యీ విషయములో నేను ఒక సంగతి చెప్పుచున్నాను. రాష్ట్రములో అనేకమందికి అనేక చోట్ల భూములు ఉండుటకద్దు. ప్రదేశభరణకు అసంతృప్తం చెరువుక్రింద కొన్ని ఎకరాలు, సింగనూరి చెరువుక్రింద కొన్ని ఎకరాలు, ధర్మవరం చెరువుక్రింద కొన్ని ఎకరాలు, హిందూపురం చెరువుక్రింద కొన్ని ఎకరాలుగల వ్యక్తులు ఎంతోమంది, ఒకే జిల్లాను చెందినవారు ఉన్నారు. మొత్తము మీద చూచుకుంటే ఒక్కొక్కరికి పది ఎకరాలు, ఇరవై ఎకరాలకు ఎక్కువగా యున్న వ్యక్తులు ఉన్నారు. కాని ఒకే ప్రదేశములో చూచినయెడల ఒక వ్యక్తికి 6 2/3 ఎకరాలకు తక్కువగానే ఉండవచ్చు.

"ఇదికాక మరొక చిన్న విషయాన్ని చెప్పుతున్నాను. గవర్నమెంటు అఫ్ఫీసర్లు procurement కొరకు వెళ్లగా ఒక గ్రామములో ఒక వ్యక్తికి అయిదు ఎకరాలకు తక్కువగా యుండుటవల్ల వారు యీ procurement నుండి తప్పించుకొనుట సాధ్యమగుచున్నది. ఇట్లా ఆ వ్యక్తికి పున్న భూమిని అంతయు చూచుకున్నయెడల యీ procurement నుంచి తప్పించుకోలేరు. ఈ విషయములో గవర్నమెంటుకు నష్టమేనని చెప్పవీలగుచున్నది. ఇట్లాంటి వ్యక్తులు ఎంతోమంది exemption సంపాదించుకోగలుగుతున్నారు. ఇటువంటివి ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఎవరెవరికి ఎంతెంత భూమియున్నచో తెలుసుకొనలేకపోతే అదంతయు గవర్నమెంటుకు నష్టమనే చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ఈ విల్లు వరతులనుబట్టి, అయ్య పదేశములలోనున్న సభ్యులు యీ clause ను అంగీకరింతురని నమ్ముతున్నాను. Procurement విషయములో ప్రతివ్యక్తికి అన్ని గ్రామములలోచేరి రెక్కచేయనందున procurement నుండి తప్పించుకొనుటవల్ల, గవర్నమెంటు procurement విధానంలో fail అయిఉన్నారు. అట్లాగే యీవిల్లు విషయములో గూడా ప్రతివ్యక్తిని ఆతనికి ఉన్న భూమి అన్నిచోట్లకలిపి ఒక unit గాచేస్తే యీ యాక్టు వర్తింపజేయగలరేగాని, ఏ గ్రామానికి ఆ గ్రామంచూచుకుంటే పెద్ద పెద్ద భూస్వాములుకుగూడా యీ యాక్టు వర్తింపకుండా తప్పించుకొనుటకు అవకాశముండగలదు. గనుక ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ క్లాజును సరిగా ప్రతికేసులో అన్వయింపజేయుటకు ప్రగుశ్రద్ధవహించే ప్రదేశ్యములనుబట్టి యీ క్లాజు చేర్చవచ్చును. కాకపోతే, పెద్ద భూస్వాములు యీ యాక్టునుండి తప్పించుకొను వీలుకలిగించితే, యీ క్లాజును తీసివేస్తేనే బాగుండుదని నా అభిప్రాయము. ఈ విషయములో మంత్రిగారు ఆలోచించవలెనని కోరుచున్నాను."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—"అన్యథా ఈ clause 3 (b) మొత్తము పొలానికి అనువర్తింపకుండా ఒక వేలిభూమి పున్నదంటే లాభ

26th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

కరమే. ఎందుచేతనంటే అనేకచోట్లలో అక్కడక్కడ వంటలుచాగా వుండుతాయి. అనేకచోట్ల ఒక వేలికన్న ఎక్కువ గేకుండా చూపించవచ్చును. ఈ యాక్టు ఒక తంజావూరు జిల్లాకే సంబంధించినది కాబట్టి వివరాలుచూపించవచ్చును. ఒకచోటనే వుంటే నష్టముచేస్తుంది. ఒక్కొక్కచోట రెండు, మూడు, అయిదు యకరాలు ఒక వేలికి తక్కువగా అక్కడక్కడ చూపించితే, యీ యాక్టును వర్తింపచేసుకోకుండా తప్పించుకోవచ్చును. అట్లాంటప్పుడు భూస్వాముల పనిమెరుగే. యీ యాక్టును నిరుపయోగముచేసినట్లే. ఈ రోజు భూస్వాములకే వుపయోగపడేదిగావుంది కాబట్టి నేను యీ సవరణను ఉపసాదిస్తూ ప్రభుత్వమువారిని అంగీకరించమని కోరుచున్నాను.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ అధ్యక్ష, ఈ amendment చాలా ముఖ్యమైంది. Select Committee stageలో దీనిమీద చాలా సవరణలు తీసుకు వచ్చారు. కాని ప్రభుత్వము ఆ రోజున అంగీకరించ లేదు. ఈ amendment విషయములో ఒక విషయము ముఖ్యంగా గమనించవలసియున్నది. ఒక వ్యక్తికి అనేక గ్రామాలలో మొత్తము 40 ఎకరాలుగాని, 50 ఎకరాలుగాని అంతకుపైన నూరు ఎకరాలుగాని వుండివున్నా ఒక్కొక్క గ్రామములో ఒక వేలికన్న తక్కువగా వుంటే యీ యాక్టు వర్తింపదు అని వున్నది. ఇది ఒక తంజావూరు జిల్లాకే తెచ్చినను, ప్రతి వ్యక్తిగూడ యీ యాక్టునుండి తప్పించుకోగల సావకాశాలు ఉండగలవు. ఇది ఎక్కడాలేవని ప్రభుత్వంచారు చెప్పడములో ఆర్థము లేదు. అయితే యీ విషయములో Select Committee ఎందుకు ఆహ్వానించలేదంటే, ప్రతి వ్యక్తికిని ఎంతెంత భూమి ఏ ఏ గ్రామములో ఉన్నదో Statistics తీయటకు కష్టసాధ్యమని Select Committee లో యిది అంగీకరించనందున యీ రోజున amendment గా తీసుకొని వచ్చాము. ఈ విచారణ కష్టసాధ్యమనినీ, ప్రభుత్వానికి యిబ్బంది అని అన్నప్పటికిని గ్రీ రాజ గోపాలాచారిగారు యీ విషయములో శ్రద్ధ వహించాలని కోరుతున్నాను. ఒక జిల్లాలో యీ విధమైన వ్యక్తులు ఎంతమంది వున్నారో దర్యాప్తు చేయించినయెడల యీ విషయము బోధపడగలదు. యింతమందియున్నా యీ యాక్టునుండి తప్పించుకుంటుకు సాధ్యపడేనప్పుడు యీ యాక్టు పెట్టిన ప్రయోజనమేమీ ఉండదు. ప్రభుత్వానికి యిది కష్టతరమైన పనికాదు. ఈ బిల్లు ముఖ్యంగా కొలుదార్ల రక్షణ కొరకు తెచ్చామని ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారు చెప్పుచున్నారు. అట్లాంటప్పుడు జిల్లాలో ఉన్న ప్రతి వ్యక్తిని యీ యాక్టునుండి exemption పొందితే యిక యీ కొలు దార్లయొక్క స్థితి విషమవుతుంది. అందువలన యీ amendment ను అంగీకరించాలని కోరుతున్నాను.

“ ఇంకొక విషయము చెప్పుతున్నాను. రాష్ట్రంలో యీ కొలుదార్లు భూములను చూడేండ్లు, అయిదేండ్లు, ఆరేండ్లు, ఆరవై యేండ్లుగాను కొలు చేస్తూన్నటువంటి వారు గలరు. అటువంటివారుకూడా యీనాడు యీ యాక్టును ఆమలులోకి తెచ్చారంటే యీ భూములు వడలిపోవలసిన స్థితి పడుతుంది.

“ ఈ amendment ప్రభుత్వమువారు అంగీకరించక పోయినట్లయితే ఎన్నో విండ్ర నుంచి అనుభవించుచున్న యీ పేద రైతులను తొలగించుటకే యీ యాక్టు తెచ్చు చున్నారని బోధపడగలదు. ముఖ్యంగా భూస్వాములకు ఎక్కువ అనుకూలమగును. వారు వివిధంగా వైనను భూమిని వారికి వున్న గ్రామములలో యీ యాక్టునుండి తప్పించుకుంటుకు భూములను ఇతరుల పరం చేసి, ఒక వేలికి తక్కువగా చూపించుటకు వీలు గలుగును. యీ విషయములో యీ పెద్ద పెద్ద భూస్వాములకే లాభము

[Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu] [26th November 1952]

చేపూర్వగలండులకు ప్రభుత్వము వారు యీ యాక్టులో యీ క్లాజు చేర్చారని చెప్పవలసియైనది. గనుక యీ amendment ను ఆమోదించవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను."

1-10
p.m.

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“മിസ്റ്റർ സ്പീക്കർ, സർ, ഈ നിയമത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു ഞങ്ങൾ സ സാരിക്കാതെ ഇരിക്കുന്നത് മലബാറിനെ സംബന്ധിക്കുന്ന ഒരു കടിയായുദ്ദേശഗതി നിയമം അടുത്തു വരുന്നത് എന്നുള്ളതു കൊണ്ടാണ്. എന്നാൽ ഈ ക്ലാസ്സ് 30 ഏകു ഹൈ ലാൻറിനു ക്ലേ ഫറാൻ ലാൻറിനു ബാധകമാകുകയില്ലെന്നുള്ളതു ഈ നിയമം കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ള ഉദ്ദേശത്തെത്തന്നെ അതേവ പരമായ പ്രൊപ്പോസിഷനായിട്ടാണ് ചെയ്യുന്നത്. വാമൊട്ടു കൂടിക്കാശരായ കടിയന്മാരെയും ഈ നിയമപ്രകാരം ക്ലാസ്സിക്കാവുന്നതാണ്. അതുകൊണ്ടു എനിക്ക് പറയാനുള്ളതു നിയമപരമായ നടപടിയെങ്കിലും ഭരണഘടനാപരമായ നടപടിയെങ്കിലും ഒരിക്കലുംതന്നെ കടിയന്മാരെയും കൂടിക്കാശരെയും സംരക്ഷിക്കുന്നതിനു നടപടിയായി നിന്നുകൂടാത്തതാകുന്നു എന്നാണ്. വാമൊട്ടു വള്ളിയും ഇല്ലായിരുന്നുവെങ്കിൽ പറയുന്നല്ലെങ്കിൽ കിളിക്കാശായിരുന്നു എന്നു പറയുന്നപോലെയാണ് ബാറ്ററമറൈറ്റു പ്രധാനമന്ത്രി ഇവക നടപടിയെങ്കിലും കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ളതു. ഇതിനെ ഞാൻ ശക്തിയായി പ്രതിഷേധിക്കുന്നു. കൂടിക്കാശരെയും കടിയന്മാരെയും ഉത്തമ പാർട്ടിയുടെ ശ്രദ്ധ ചെലുത്താതെ ഭരണഘടനാപരമായ നടപടിയെങ്കിലും കൊണ്ടുവന്നു അടിസ്ഥാനപരമായ ഉദ്ദേശത്തിൽനിന്നു വ്യതിചലിക്കുന്നത് തെറ്റാണ്. ഞാൻ കമ്മ്യൂണിസറ്റുകളെക്കുറിച്ചും മിസ്റ്റർ സ്പീക്കർക്കു ഏതെങ്കിലും ഉദ്ദേശഗതിയെ ഞാൻ പിൻതാങ്ങുന്നു.”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have to oppose this amendment. For, in the first place, there may not be many cases of scattered holdings. There may be only some cases to be provided for. If we make any amendment in the manner in which it is proposed, it will lead to the appointment of a roving commission and a totalizing officer to find out the number of cases wherein there are scattered holdings of land. If it is left as it is, I think it will work all right."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is the hon. Member pressing his amendment?"

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—“ I am not withdrawing my amendment.”

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

‘ Omit the words “ in any village ” and “ in such village ” occurring in lines 2 and 3 of sub-clause (b). ’

The amendment was lost.

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“As regards, Sir, Mr. P. Ramamurthi's amendment to be moved I would like to tell the House that Nos. 6, 7 and 9, the amendments of Mr. Sri Krishna, Mr. Bapanayya and Mr. Rajagopal Rao will be covered by the decision on the previous amendment.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

'In sub-clause (b) for the words "in any village if the land held by him in such village", substitute the words "if the total extent of land held by him".'

“ I am not going to repeat the arguments that have already been put forward. The main purpose of the amendment is not

26th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

to exclude people who own land in bits in different areas. I think it is a very reasonable request and I do not see any reason why Government should not accept it. There is no administrative difficulty at all with regard to this. If there is, however, a little administrative difficulty it should not weigh with the Government when considering the working of this Act, because if this amendment is given effect to it will benefit about five to six thousand tenants in the district of Tanjore. There are people who own lands in tiny bits."

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ మన ఆర్థికశాఖ మంత్రిగారు Opposition members మాట్లాడుతూ ఉంటే ఏమీ time waste చేస్తున్నారని భావిస్తున్నారు ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member has not addressed the Chair nor has he seconded the amendment.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ Chair ను ఆక్రమిస్తే చేస్తున్నానండి. అధ్యక్షు, ఈ విధంగా Opposition members టైము waste చేస్తున్నారని ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారున్ను, ఆర్థిక శాఖ మంత్రిగారున్ను భావించడం పాలా పొర పాటు. వారు ప్రజానికానికి ఏమీ మేలు కలుగ జేయవలెననే ఉద్దేశ్యంతో మన జేస్తున్నారో నీమీ అంతకంటే ఎక్కువ మేలు కలుగ జేయవలెననే ఉద్దేశ్యంతోనే మాట్లాడుతున్నామని వారు గుర్తించవలసియున్నది. బహుశా మా వాదన తెలియక పోవడంవల్ల ఈ విధంగా భావిస్తున్నారేమో. అట్లయితే మా అభిప్రాయాలను తెలుసుకొనేందుకు ప్రయత్నించవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. ఇప్పుడు ఈ సమరణను బలపరుస్తూ మాట్లాడుతున్నాను. ఈ సందర్భంలో తీసుకొనిరావలసిన ఇంకొక వాదన ఏమిటంటే పట్టణాల్లో ఉండేటటువంటి ఆనేక మంది లాయర్లు, వీరంతా, గూడా ఒక ఎకరా భూమిని ఒక ఊళ్లో, ఇంకొక ఎకరా భూమిని ఇంకొక చోట ఈ చూచిరి కొనకొంటూ యుంటారు. వీరికి పట్టణు వర్తించుకుండా తప్పించుకొని నడచుకొనే పద్ధతులు చాలా తెలిసి ఉంటాయి. ఇటువంటిప్పుడు రైతులకు న్యాయము జరుగుచుకు వీలుండదు. ప్రభుత్వము నిజంగా రైతుల ముక్కుమేలు కోరుతున్నదంటే ఈ సమరణను తప్పకుండా అంగీకరించాలి. లేక పోయినట్లయితే కొన్ని వేల మంది tenants కు ప్రభుత్వము నష్టము చేసి నటువంటిదభ్రతుండనే విషయాన్ని మరిచిపోవడం విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తూ కనీసము ఈ సమరణానైనా ప్రభుత్వము అంగీకరించి tenants కు ఆ విధంగా నష్టము కాకుండా చేయవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. అయితే దీనికి ప్రభుత్వము ఏవో administrative difficulties ఉన్నాయని చెప్పుతున్నారు. కాని పోలీసు డిపార్టుమెంటులో Motor Vehicles Act మొదలగువాటిని తీసుకొని రావడంలో ఆనేక రకరకాల difficulties ను కొని తెచ్చిపెట్టుకొని ఉంటున్నప్పుడు ఈ విషయములో రైతులు బాగుపడే సందర్భములో administrative difficulties అని అడ్డు చెప్పడం సరియైన వాదన కాదు. ఇది ఒప్పుకోదగిన వాదన కాదు. ఇంకా బలమైన వాదన ఏదైనా ఉంటే చెప్పవచ్చుగాని, ఈ వాదన మాత్రము సరియైంది కాదు. ముఖ్యంగా కాంగ్రెస్ పక్షంవారు రైతుల తరపున నిలబడి వారికి మేలుజేయ దలచుకొంటే ఈ సమరణను వారు తప్పక బలపరచవలసియున్నదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను.”

[26th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendment moved—

"In sub-clause (b) for the words "in any village if the land held by him in such village" substitute the words "if the total extent of land held by him".

"Hon. Members Sri Krishna and Sri Bapanayya need not move their amendments."

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—"అధ్యక్షా, ఈ సవరణ ఇంతకు ముందు move చేసినటువంటి స్వయం ప్రకారంగా సవరణనే పోలియున్నది. కాబట్టి, దీని విషయములో మా అభిప్రాయాన్ని తెలుపుతున్నాము. ముఖ్యంగా ఈ సవరణను గనుక అంగీకరించక పోయినట్లయితే, ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క ముఖ్యద్దేశమే పోతుందని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ విషయాన్ని ముఖ్యంగా రెవెన్యూ మంత్రిగారు, ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు గుర్తించవలసియున్నది. కారణమేమిటంటే, ఈ బిల్లు ప్రవేశపెట్టడములో, ఖాస్సాములు, వారి పొలాన్ని కొలుకు ఇచ్చిన సందర్భములో ఆ కొలుదాన్లయొక్క హక్కును రక్షించడమనే దీనియొక్క ముఖ్యద్దేశమై యున్నది. ఆలాగుప్పుడు ఒక్కొక్కచోట 6 2/3 ఎకరాలలోపుగా ఉన్న ఖాస్సాములను మినహాయించినట్లయితే, చాలామంది ఖాస్సాములు దీనివల్ల affect కాకుండా అనేకవేల మంది కొలుదాన్లకు నష్టంకలిగే విధముగా ఉది పరిణమిస్తుంది. ఎందుకనగా ఒక్కొక్కచోట 6 2/3 ఎకరాల హక్కున 5, 6 చోట్ల కలిసి మొత్తము 30, 40 ఎకరాలు ఒక్క ఖాస్సామికే ఉండవచ్చును. ఈ పరిస్థితులలో కొలుదాన్లకు నిజంగా చేయదలచుకొన్న సహాయము జరుగదు. కొన్నివేల కొలుదాన్లు దీనివల్ల నష్టపడవలసి వస్తుంది. కనుక ఇప్పటికైనా ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క ప్రధాన ఉద్దేశాన్ని ప్రభుత్వం గుర్తించి ఈ సవరణను మాత్రము అంగీకరించి దానిని ఆమోదించాలని రెవెన్యూ మంత్రిగారిని ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారిని కోరుతున్నాను. అదే మా అభిప్రాయము."

SRI G. BAPANAYYA :—"అధ్యక్షా, నా ప్రతిపాదనయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము విమిటంటే, సాధారణంగా ఖాస్సాములు ఒకే ఒక ప్రాంతంలో తమ పొలాన్ని కలిగివుండటం లేదు. వీరు అనేక గ్రామాలలో పొలాలు కలిగిఉంటారు. అటువంటప్పుడు, వీరికి ఒక్కొక్కచోట 6 2/3 ఎకరాల హక్కున ఇప్పుడున్న clause ప్రకారం మినహాయించవలసి యుండుంది. ఆ పక్షములో మొత్తము వీరికి అన్ని చోట్ల కలిసి అనేక ఎకరాల పొలము ఉండినప్పటికీ, ప్రతిచోట ఈ పరిమితిలోపుగా ఉన్నందున మినహాయించబడి చాలామంది tenants కు అన్యాయము కలుగజేసినట్లవుతుంది. ఒకేచోట మాత్రమే 6 2/3 ఎకరాలకు మించకుండా ఉండినట్లయితే, దానిని ఖాస్సామే స్వయంగా సాగుచేసుకోవడానికి అవకాశము ఇవ్వవలసిందే. కాని ఒకరికే అనేక గ్రామాలలో ఒక్కొక్కచోట 6 2/3 ఎకరాలలోపుగా ఉన్నటువంటి పొలాలన్నీ, మినహాయించడంవల్ల, అనేకమంది కొలుదాన్లకు నష్టము కలుగుతుంది. కనుక, ఒకచోటనే ఉన్న ఖాస్సామినే రెక్కవేసుకొని మినహాయించ కూడదనే ఈ ప్రతిపాదనను ప్రభుత్వము తప్పనిసరిగా ఆమోదించవలసినదిగా కోరుతున్నాను."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is no use repeating the same arguments and contentions too much. So I shall not go into all that. I want to point out the possible lapses in the mind of Mr. Ramamurthi. It is true he is obsessed by one fact; namely, that some big landowners possess small bits of land elsewhere, and he asks, why should we

26th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

prevent the application of the Act to these small bits. On the other hand, I have got the small owners of land in my mind. The object of the Government is not to benefit one or the other. The small owner for instance who has three acres in one village and another three acres in another village—must he be made to worry going through all these formalities and technicalities of this law? (Hon. Members: No, No.) Therefore I wish to prevent it. That is what my hon. Colleague meant when he said ‘administrative difficulties’. He did not mean difficulties for the Secretariat or the Ministers or the other Government staff. He meant difficulties arising in putting into operation the provisions of this law—the difficulties for the tenant, the landowner, the court and everybody else. If we include the small bits of land also, we must have a totalizing mechanism and all that, such as we have for calculating the income derived by a person not only here but throughout the world for purposes of income-tax assessment. We have to have such machinery if we have to include in the case of the landowner all the bits of land that he possesses in all the villages in the Tanjore district, or, as some other amendment puts it, in the State of Madras. This would lead to great difficulty in finding out to whom it belongs and to whom it does not belong and all that. Therefore it is that we wish that every village officer’s jurisdiction should be a unit. Therefore I ask the opposite side to accept the clause as it is. It is only then that the lease deeds could be written and the procedure will be easy. It is with this object that we said ‘in one village’ and not with the object to provide either more or less for the landowner or the tenant. It is only with a view to making the application of the Act easy and acceptable from the village officer upwards. I therefore hope that the decision already reached on Mr. Swayamprakasam’s amendment will be made legally applicable to the rest of the amendments.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, after hearing the Hon. the Chief Minister . . . ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not wish to interrupt but I hope the Hon. Speaker agrees with me that it is not usual to allow a right of reply to movers of amendments.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is not only usual, but it is our right and it cannot be cut down.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want just to bring to the notice of the Government certain things with regard to the difficulties that are now being sought to be made out in accepting the amendment. Recently Government have promulgated an order called the ‘Levy Procurement Order’ for the procurement of foodgrains. Under the order it is possible for the Government to take into account the total extent of land held by

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [26th November 1952]

a particular individual irrespective of the fact that that land may or may not be situated in the same village. On that basis the small landowner has to be taken into account here also, irrespective of whether he has lands situated in one village or lands distributed in a number of villages. When it is a question of paddy procurement from the landowner (interruption). I am not saying that it is a wrong thing. It is a good principle. I only ask why that principle should not operate when it comes to a question of giving protection to the tenant. Why should these difficulties, administrative or whatever they might be, come in the way of giving protection to the tenants of such landowners whose lands are situated in various villages? Therefore, I am not convinced with the reply of the Government and I am pressing my amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Regarding the point raised by the Hon. the Chief Minister the rule is clear. A Member who has moved a substantive motion (not being a cut motion on a budget, a supplementary, an additional or an excess grant or an amendment to a resolution) may speak again by way of reply. He has a right. I shall now put the amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

'In sub-clause (b) for the words "in any village if the land held by him in such village", substitute the words "if the total extent of land held by him".'

The amendment was declared lost.

Sri P. Ramamurthi demanded a poll. The division bell was rung.

MR. SPEAKER:—"In view of the fact that the House has already given a verdict on the amendment of Mr. Swayamprakasam, I wish to know whether Mr. Ramamurthi is pressing for a division on his amendment. I think he is not."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"In view of the fact that already a decision has been taken on a similar amendment, I am not now pressing for a division on my amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"So the amendment of Mr. Ramamurthi is lost."

The House will now adjourn for lunch and reassemble at 3 p.m.

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"I shall take up the amendment of Sri K. Rajagopla Rao. But before that I want to know whether his amendment falls within the scope of the Bill."

26th November 1952]

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“అయినప్పటికీ, సభ్యుల ఆధిపత్యా-
లను తెలుసుకొనుటకు ప్రతి mover కు కూడ చూట్లాడే chance ఉంటే మంచిదని
నా ఆధిపత్యము.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I think the hon. Member has
not understood what exactly the Hon. Speaker has said.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member wants to substitute for
the words “ in any village ” the words “ in the State of Madras ”
in sub-clause (b) of clause 3 of the Bill. First of all I want to
know what he means by it.”

* **Sri K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—**“ అధ్యక్ష, నా సవరణయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము, ఘాస్వామికి రాష్ట్రములో ఎక్కడైనా సరే 6-2/3 ఎకరాలకు మించి ఘామి ఉన్న వ్యవస్థ యీ వట్టం వర్తింపాలి. “ ఒక్కొక్క ఊళ్లో 6-2/3 ఎకరాలకు మించి ఉన్న వ్యవస్థ అనేదాన్ని తీసేయాలి. ఈ సవరణ అంగీకరించకపోతే ప్రధాన మంత్రిగాని, ప్రభుత్వవ్యవస్థగాని ఈ బిల్లు ఏ సమర్థవ్యములో తేబడినదని చెప్పుకొంటున్నారో, ఆ ఉద్దేశ్యానికే భంగము కలుగుతుంది. ఉదాహరణకు ఒక ఘాస్వామికి పాతిక ఎకరాల ఘామి ఒకే గ్రామములో ఉన్నట్లయితే, ఈ బిల్లు వర్తిస్తుంది. మరొక ఘాస్వామికి ఇదే పాతిక ఎకరాల ఘామి 4, 5 ఊళ్లలో వంతుకమై ఉంటే అతనికి మాత్రం వర్తింపదు. అంటే, ఒకే రకమైన అస్తికలిగినటువంటి ఘాస్వాముల మధ్య ఈ బిల్లువల్ల విభేదము కల్పింపబడుతున్నది. అందుచేత ఈ బిల్లు అందరి ఘాస్వాములకూ సమానంగా వర్తింపజేసి, tenants కు ఎక్కువ లాభము కలిగించేట్లు చేయాలి. లేకపోతే ఈ బిల్లు ఉద్దేశ్యానికే భంగము కలుగుతుంది. ఈ బిల్లును నీళ్లు కార్చివేయడానికి, అప్పుడే ఘాస్వాములు అనేకరకమైన ప్రయత్నాలు చేస్తున్నారు. పాతిక ఎకరాలు ఉండే ఘాస్వామి, ఆ ఘామిని తన భార్యపేరటా, బిడ్డల పేరటా విభజించి ఈ బిల్లునుండి తప్పించుకోడానికై ప్రయత్నిస్తున్నాడు. కనుక ఇటువంటి తప్పుడు మార్గాలకు అవకాశము లేకుండా ఉండేటందుకు ఈ సవరణ అంగీకరించడం చాలా అవసరం. అయితే రివిన్యూమంత్రి ఈ సవరణను అంగీకరిస్తే ఆవరణలో పెట్టడం చాలా కష్టమింటున్నారు. ఇది నిజంకాదు. చాలా సులభంగా, చేయవచ్చు. ఏయే గ్రామములో ఏయే ఆసామీకి ఎంతెంత పొలము ఉన్నదని మొదలైన రెక్కలన్నీ కరణాలద్వారా తయారుచేయించవచ్చును. అందుచేత ఇది difficult task అని చెప్పటం సరియైనదికాదు. కాబట్టి ఎక్కువ మంది కౌలుదార్లకు నష్టం వాటిల్లకుండా తగిన రక్షణ ఇవ్వాలనే ఉద్దేశ్యమే నిజంగా ప్రభుత్వానికుంటే ఈ సవరణను తప్పక అంగీకరించవలసియ్యున్నది. లేకపోతే, ఈ బిల్లువల్ల ఏ మాత్రమూ ప్రయోజనం ఉండదని నేను మనవిచేస్తూ, నా పేరున లున్న సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను—

In sub-clause (b) for the words “ in any village ” substitute the words “ in the State of Madras.”

In sub-clause (b)- for the words “ in such village ” substitute the words “ in the State of Madras.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ నేను దీనిని బలపరుస్తున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Has the Hon. Minister for Revenue anything to say about this amendment? ”

[26th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" I have nothing to add to what I had already said, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—" The question is—

(i) In sub-clause (b), for the words " in any village " substitute the words " in the State of Madras."

(ii) In sub-clause (b) for the words " in such village " substitute the words " in the State of Madras " "

The amendment was lost.

* SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM:—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following amendment standing in my name:—

' Add the following words at the end of sub-clause (b):—

" but the landowner shall pay the pannaiyals according to this Act if he engages pannaiyals."

" The small landholders, viz., those who possess less than one veli are no longer bound by this Bill since it has fixed the exemption limit as 6-2/3 acres, i.e., one veli. Suppose these mirasidars engage pannaiyals, they are under no obligation to pay their pannaiyals according to the provisions of the Act. Their own comrades working under mirasidars possessing more than one veli will get fair wages which this Bill provides for them. This reminds me of the Tamil saying ' ஒரு ஊரில் இரண்டு பைத்தியக் காரர்களா? '. If the pannaiyals working on the lands of these small mirasidars possessing less than one veli each clamour for the same wages got by their brethren working in the fields of the big mirasidars, their cry will be a cry in the wilderness. If these poor pannaiyals go to the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court, it will serve no purpose. I know thousands of such applications are pouring in in the Revenue Court at Mayuram. But what does the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court say? They say, ' What can we do? The law has fixed one veli, i.e., 6-2/3 acres as the exemption limit. Unless and until the law is amended lowering the exemption limit, we cannot do anything '. What is the result? We find only discontent among these poor pannaiyals. Their mirasidars refuse to pay them higher wages. They say, ' We will pay you according to the old custom of half a marakkal as daily wage. This is half of what we have been asked to give under the Mayuram agreement '. In order to provide an equitable share in the produce for these pannaiyals also along with their brethren working in the big pannais, I move this amendment, Sir."

The amendment was duly seconded.

MR. SPEAKER:—" Amendment moved—

' Add the following words at the end of sub-clause (b):—

" but the landowner shall pay the pannaiyals according to this Act if he engages pannaiyals."

" I want to know whether the Hon. Minister for Revenue wants to say anything on this amendment."

26th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"The hon. Member was pleading for the abolition of the pannaiyal system at the time of the introduction of this Bill. Now he comes and says that pannaiyals working under mirasidars owning less than one veli should be given equal rights as those working under mirasidars owning more than one veli. I am sorry I cannot accept his amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is the hon. Member, Sri K. R. Sambandam pressing his amendment?"

SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM:—"Yes, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

‘Add the following words at the end of sub-clause (b):—

“but the landowner shall pay the pannaiyals according to this Act if he engages pannaiyals.”

The amendment was lost.

* SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:—

3-10
p,m

‘Insert the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (b):—

“Provided that the benefits of the above sub-clause shall accrue only to those who were landowners on 23rd August 1952 and to those who become entitled to property on account of partition and to legatees who would be heirs, had the deceased died intestate.”

Sir, this amendment is intended to minimize the mischief which would otherwise result from the working of sub-clause 3 (b). It has been claimed by the framers of this Bill that they want to hold the scales even between the landowners and the tenants; but it is not difficult to find out in whose favour the scale is tilted. By a comparison of the definitions of ‘tenant’ and ‘landowner’ the matter is clear. While the definition of ‘tenant’ is narrow and restricted, the other is wide and comprehensive. I do not propose to read the definitions. But two important expressions as ‘the assignee and persons deriving rights from him’ are conspicuously absent from the definition of ‘tenant’. The inclusion of these two phrases in the definition of ‘landowner’ is potentially dangerous to whatever benefits this Bill is supposed to confer on the tenant. To understand the full implications, it must be read in conjunction with sub-clause 3 (b). Of course, the word ‘landowner’ includes assignee. Suppose there is a landowner ‘A’ who to-day has 60 acres of land and after coming into force of this Act he assigns the whole land in the names of 10 persons, his near relatives and friends including himself, at 6 acres each. As a result of working of sub-clause 3 (b), all these pieces of land will be outside the purview of this Bill. The Bill imposes a restriction on the rights of the tenant because it says that the tenant forfeits all the rights under the Bill if he sub-leases the land.

[Sri M. Narayana Kurup] [26th November 1952]

I think the intention of the framers of this Bill must be to protect the persons who are landowners. There is no reason why an assignee who with open eyes takes the assignment of the land after interests are created in favour of the tenant, must be in a better position than the landowner himself, for it is well known that an assignee cannot have higher rights than the assignor. To-day an assignor who is in possession of more than 6-2/3 acres is bound by the provisions of this Bill. But an assignee taking 6 acres of land from a landowner gets higher rights than the assignor himself. This is opposed to all principles of law. Moreover, we know how this provision will be abused by landowners who will pick and choose and take full opportunity of assigning the lands of those tenants whom they do not favour and such tenants will be helpless victims to this kind of action on the part of the landowners. Under section 15 of the Evidence Act, a tenant is prohibited from questioning the title of the landowner, which means also the assignee; he is a third party to the contract and he cannot question the document. As has been pronounced by judicial authorities, *benami* transactions in India are a rule but not an exception. If, with a view to deliberately defeat the provisions of this Bill, the landowners assign their lands in portions of 6 acres, the tenants will be without any remedy. Therefore, Sir, my amendment is just and reasonable and the intention is to protect whatever rights this Act confers upon the tenant. I hope the House as well as the Government will find it acceptable."

SRI M. NARAYANA NAMBIAR:—"I second the amendment moved by my hon. Friend Sri M. Narayana Kurup."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendment moved:—

"Insert the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (b):—

"Provided that the benefits of the above sub-clause shall accrue only to those who were landowners on 23rd August 1952 and to those who become entitled to property on account of partition and to legatees who would be heirs, had the deceased died intestate." "

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, the hon. Member who moved the amendment has spoken on the basis that some kind of advantage is given and that advantage should not accrue to a purchaser. That is the basis of his argument. But the motive and reason behind this provision is not a question of advantage or disadvantage, but that the complicate provisions of this Act should not apply to small owners; once an assignment takes place—and it is not a fraud but a real assignment, the assignee becomes a small owner. It would be administratively difficult to apply this Act to some small owners and not apply it to some other small owners and keep the history of their title in order to enforce the Act. It would be very, very complicated and I submit, it would be undesirable."

26th November 1952]

* SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP:—“ Sir, there is absolutely no complication. I only mean that assignees in future should not have this personal right because this is a right which is given to the landowner in consideration of his being in possession of the land. Where is the complication if it is stated ‘except those on whom properties devolve by partition or as a legatee’? The future assignees will not be entitled to claim exemption under this sub-clause. I fail to see where the complication is. Therefore, I submit, there is no complication because we do not discriminate as between one future assignee and another future assignee.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The question is—

‘ Insert the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (b) :—

“ Provided that the benefits of the above sub-clause shall accrue only to those who were landowners on 23rd August 1952 and to those who become entitled to property on account of partition and to legatees who would be heirs, had the deceased died intestate.” ”

The amendment was lost.

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:—

‘ Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (b) :—

“ Provided such landowner wishes to cultivate the farm by himself.” ”

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—“ ఈ సవరణను నేను చాలా ముఖ్యమైనటువంటిదిగా భావిస్తున్నాను. కారణమేమిటంటే, exemption అనే టిటువంటిది small holdersకు ఉండవలసిందే. ఇది అవసరమేగాని అది ఒక పరిమితిలో ఉండాలి అని నేను భావిస్తున్నాను. స్వతంత్రంగా నేవ్యము చేసుకోవడానికి ఈ exemption ఉండాలి. అలాగే occupation right ఇస్తున్నట్లయితే, ఖామి అక్రీతులు అధికారాన్ని గనుక కాలుదారుకు ఇస్తున్నటువంటి సందర్భంలో అయితే ఈ విధమైనటువంటి exemption వర్తింపజేయడంలో ఆర్థముంది. Small holdersకు ఉన్నటువంటి కొద్ది అన్ని అవగా 20 ఎకరాల మెట్టి, 6-2/3 ఎకరాల మాగాణి ఈ క్లాస్ పోకుండా, వాళ్ల చేతులలోనే ఉండాలి గనుక వారికి రక్షణ ఇవ్వడం అవసరము. కాని ఈ సందర్భములో tenantsకు protection ఇవ్వడం ఆసేటటువంటిది, ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క ముఖ్యోద్దేశ్యము. అయితే పది ఎకరాలు ఉన్నటువంటి మిరాశిదారుగాని, ఖాస్వామిగాని ఆయన నేద్యానికి ఇస్తే ఆ నేద్యగాదు, అంటే కాలుదారు ఒక విధమైనటువంటి rate ఖాస్వామికి ఇస్తున్నప్పుడు, 6 ఎకరాలుగల small holders ఏవో క్లాస్ ఇతర ఉద్యోగం చేసుకొంటూ వన జీవితావసరాలను తీర్చుకొనే నిమిత్తం ఇతరతా ఆదాయాన్ని సంపాదించుకొంటు ఉండేటటువంటి వ్యక్తి ఆ పొలానికి పోకుండా దాన్ని కాలుకు ఇచ్చినట్లయితే, ఆ కాలుదారుకు మూత్రము ప్రక్కన ఉన్నటువంటి కాలుదారుకు ఏ రక్షణ ఇస్తామో అదే రక్షణ ఈ బిల్లులో ఉన్న మినహాయింపుద్వారా లేకుండాపోతుంది. అందుకని కాలుదారుకు రక్షణ ఇవ్వడం చాలా ముఖ్యము. ఈ రక్షణ ఇవ్వడంలో 5 ఎకరాలు ఖాఖామందునుండి నేద్యానికి తీసుకొంటే ఒక విధమైన పద్ధతి, 20 ఎకరాలు ఖాఖామందునుండి నేద్యానికి తీసుకుంటే

[Sri M. Hanumantha Rao] [26th November 1952]

మరొక రకమైన పద్ధతి అనుసరించడం కాలదార్ల మధ్యన వ్యత్యాసము ఏర్పాటుచేసి అనారోగ్యకరమైనటువంటి పోటీలను ప్రేరేపించటంగా ఉంటుంది. కాబట్టి కాలదార్లు ఎవరైనానో, ఏ ఖామిఅయినానో, దానికి తప్పనిసరిగా పరమైన మూడు కాలదార్లకు ఇస్తామో ఆ రక్షణ అందరు కాలదార్లకు ఇవ్వాలన్నదే ముఖ్యమైన విషయము. అయితే small holders స్వతముగా నేద్యము చేసుకొని శ్రమపడిటటు వంటివాళ్లకు రక్షణ ఇవ్వవలసిందే. పాలము కలిగియుండే హక్కువారికి ఉండవలసిందే. కాని ఈ విధంగా కాదు కాబట్టి ఈ సవరణను తప్పనిసరిగా అంగీకరించాలని నేను ప్రభుత్వంవారిని కోరుతున్నాను.”

3-20
p.m.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Sir, I second this amendment. It is a very reasonable amendment. It is equitable both to the landholder as well as to the tenant; and particularly it is designed to protect the small landholders. Therefore, I hope that the Government will accept this amendment without any reservation whatsoever.”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“ Sir, the amendment itself as framed, is defective. Logically speaking, it must read like this: “to cultivate the farm by himself or herself”. (Hon. Members: We have no objection). The difficulty will be this: Suppose a poor old widow is in possession of a piece of land. According to this amendment, she cannot herself cultivate the land; and if this amendment is accepted, she will have to leave the land and go away. As I said, the amendment is defective, and by accepting the amendment, we will only be creating new difficulties. So, I oppose the amendment.”

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—“ రివిన్యూ మంత్రిగారు వృద్ధ వితంతువులకు రక్షణ అవునరమని, మైనర్లకు రక్షణ అవునరమని సవరణను వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నారు. కాని అది సరికాదు. వృద్ధ వితంతువులకు, మైనర్లకు అస్తి రక్షణ ఉండవలసిందే. కాని యిష్టంపచ్చిన వివరణ కౌలు వసూలు చేయటానికిగాను. పాలమీద నేద్యంచేసేవానికే ముఖ్యమైన రక్షణ వుండటం అవునరం. కనుక నా సవరణను ఓటుకు పెట్టమని కోరుతున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I now put the amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (b):—

“Provided such landowner wishes to cultivate the farm by himself.” ’ ”

The amendment was lost.

SRI P. T. RAJAN:—“ Sir, I am moving the amendment which stands in my name . . . ”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The hon. Member should address the Chair.”

* SRI P. T. RAJAN:—“ I thought I addressed the Chair, Sir. If I have really made a mistake, I convey my apologies to the Chair.”

26th November 1952] [Sri P. T. Rajan]

“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, with your permission, I move the amendment which stands in my name. It reads as follows:—

‘ Number the existing clause (3) as sub-clause (1) of that clause and add the following as sub-clause (2) :—

“(2) Where a landowner holds land exceeding one veli whether in the same village or in different villages, he shall be entitled to retain in any one village, land not exceeding one veli for cultivation by himself and the members of his family and this Act shall not apply in respect of the land so retained by him.”

“ As regards the amendment itself, it is simple and self-explanatory. However, I wish to say that agriculture is supposed to be the oldest and noblest of occupations. With the advent of foreign rule, especially British rule, landholders for more reasons than one, became absentee landholders. Now, things have changed and there has been a feeling in some quarters that people should revert to the old occupation. When such is the idea, if, as a result of this Act, people are so minded and inclined to revert to agriculture and carry on agricultural operations themselves, it is but reasonable that the Government should allow them to do so. I hope, Sir, that the Government will accept this amendment.”

SRI P. B. K. RAJACHIDAMBARAM:—“ I second the amendment, Sir.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ ఆధ్యక్షా, నేను ఈ సవరణను వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నాను. ఈ సవరణను అంగీకరించినట్లయితే భూస్వామ్య విధానం యథా తథంగానే ఉంటుంది. ఈ బిల్లు తెచ్చిన కారణములు అలాగానే నిలచిఉంటవి. దున్నేవానికే భూమిపై హక్కు ఉండాలి అనే ముఖ్య సూత్రానికిది విరుద్ధం. అందు చేత నేను దీనిని తప్పక వ్యతిరేకించవలసివచ్చినది. ”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ Government are sorry, Sir, they cannot accept the amendment. It will complicate everything.”

SRI P. T. RAJAN:—“ I feel it is impossible to persuade the Government even to do a small thing like this. I will leave it at that.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ Sir, we are all interested in young gentlemen of landowning families going back to the land; but we must make laws for the generality of things. That is the reason why we cannot accept this amendment.”

* SRI P. T. RAJAN:—“ I do not say that we should make an exemption automatically. On the other hand, if the landholder who owns more than one veli will tell the local officials that he is

[Sri P. T. Rajan] [26th November 1952]

going to carry on agricultural operations, it ought to be possible under this Act, to give him that exemption. I do not think anything can stand in the way of this amendment being accepted."

The amendment was put and lost.

3-30 P.m. MR. SPEAKER:—"Sri Venkatarama Ayyar's amendment for the insertion of new sub-clause (2)."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker, although here and there some words are different, the substance of the motion has already been decided upon, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is that clause 3 do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was carried.

Clause 4.

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"Mr. Speaker. Sir, I move—

For the words "appoint any person . . . Conciliation Officer", substitute the words "appoint one person on behalf of the Government, one person on behalf of the tenant and one person on behalf of the landowner as Conciliation Board".

"అధ్యక్షా, నా సవరణ స్వాయం ప్రేరణతోనే. Conciliation board లో Xవర్గ మెంబు ఉద్వేగితోవాడు, ఖాసా మియొక్క, రైతు యొక్క ప్రతినిధులను కూడా చేర్చవలెనని నేను కోరుతున్నాను. ఏ సమస్య వైశ్వజ్ఞికి సక్రమంగా పరిష్కరింప వలెనంటే, ఆ తగాదాను సరిదిద్దించే ఉభయపక్షాలవారి ప్రతినిధులు బోర్డులో ఉన్నట్లయితే ఇదివరి అభివాదాలు సాకిల్లంగా తెలుసుకోవటానికి అవకాశం ఉంటుంది. స్వాయం జరుగుటకు వీలుంటుంది. ఒక్కో ప్రభుత్వోద్వేగితైనా పరిష్కార భారముంచినట్లయితే అన్ని సందర్భాలలోనూ స్వాయం జరుగకపోవచ్చు. మా ఆమ భవాలబట్టి, సాధారణంగా ప్రభుత్వోద్వేగిలు పనికుబడి, ధనంకలిగిన ఖాసా మిలకే అనుకూలంగా తిరుచిస్తారని చూడవచ్చు. ప్రభాసామాన్యంలో కూడా ఇట్టి భావమే పనిలొరాఉంది. కనుక ఇరువైపులవారికి స్వాయం కలుగజేయవలెననే తలంపు ప్రభుత్వానికున్నట్లయితే నా సవరణను ఆంగీకరించాలనేది కోరుతున్నాను."

* SRI PILLA LAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"నేను ఈ సవరణను బలపరిస్తున్నాను. కౌలుదార్లను స్వాయంజరగా చేసి ఈ సవరణను ఆంగీకరించ వలసిన అవకాశం ఎంతైనా ఉంది. Industrial Tribunals విషయంలో ప్రభుత్వోద్వేగిలు అనుసరిస్తున్న విధానాలను ట్టిమానే, ఈ conciliation బోర్డులో కౌలుదార్ల ప్రతినిధులు ఉండడం ఎంత అవసరమా బోధపడుతుంది. కన్సీలియేషన్ బోర్డులో ఖాసా మిల, కౌలుదార్ల ప్రతినిధులు ఉండవలెననుకోవడం సబబైన సవరణ కనుక బానిని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఆంగీకరిస్తారని అనిపిస్తున్నాను."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"This, Mr. Speaker, is a very salutary and good principle which has been accepted almost all over the word in all civilized countries. When disputes arise between two parties one of the most fundamental principles, when the method of conciliation is attempted, is that it is better to get the

26th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

parties together so that all of them can put their heads together and see if a method of resolving the conflict cannot be evolved. Now, Sir, the position is that a Government official who often-times may not know anything of the conditions prevailing in the particular district but is clothed with the powers of conciliation has to do this job, but that defeats the very purpose for which conciliation is intended. When a representative of the landholder is there and when a representative of the tenant or the pannaiyal is there the three are associated with the very task of conciliation. But in the other case, the Conciliation Officer tries to get the parties together and suggests some remedies. But on the other hand, if the representatives of the two contending parties come together for a common purpose, the very purpose of conciliation, the very approach to conciliation changes. I suggest, Sir, that the method of conciliation by bringing together the parties and clothing them with responsibility for coming to some terms is the best method of conciliation, and that is what has been accepted in all the International Labour Conventions with regard to the settlement of industrial disputes. This method has been followed with good results all the world over, and I do not think that in the case of the peasants of Tanjore alone a different method should be followed by asking the Conciliation Officer to take upon himself the onus and the responsibility of bringing about conciliation between the contending parties. Oftentimes under the system suggested in the Bill, the Government Official himself will be subject to the charge, he is open to the charge that he has favoured someone to the detriment of some other. It is bound to happen, and if that happens, the Conciliation Officer will lose authority, and he cannot command the full confidence of other parties. If such a situation develops, it is a very bad and unhealthy thing and no conciliation will be possible and unrest will continue. In the interest of seeing that conciliation takes place, I do not think that Government should have any difficulty whatever in accepting the amendment. I, therefore, commend this amendment to the acceptance of this House."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, there will be no difficulty if I accept the premises, but unfortunately I do not believe that the procedure proposed of three persons sitting together, namely, the Conciliation Officer, the representative, not of the tenants in general but of the tenant concerned and the representative of the landowner concerned, will work. If these three sit there . . ."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"That is not the proposal."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Let the hon. Member read the amendment even when I am speaking."

"The proposal is that the two parties concerned and the Conciliation Officer should form a board to perform the functions of the Conciliation Officer. I submit, Sir, that it would not work and it cannot work under any system or psychology. The Conciliation Officer has to pass orders, and it may go in appeal also."

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [26th November 1952]

Under the present proposal, below the Conciliation Officer's dais, there will be the landowner and the tenant. All the heads will be brought together; only they will not clash on the bench; they will be there to exchange views and he will then pass orders and it will be subject to appeal. I submit that this amendment is not reasonable."

3-40
p.m.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"On a matter of personal explanation, Sir. If there is some misunderstanding I want to clear it. If the Hon. the Chief Minister's difficulty with regard to the amendment is that it should provide for representation for the generality of landlords and the generality of tenants, we will certainly accept it."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I shall not deal with it because it was not the amendment. If that is done it will become a Legislative Assembly and not a Conciliation Body."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"అధ్యక్షా, శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఈ సవరణను వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్న మాట్లాడారు. సవరణ వర్షకు బదులు చెప్పవలసినది శ్రీ మాణిక్యవేలు నాయకరుగారు. కనుక రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు మాట్లాడిన సరువాత ప్రతిపక్ష స్పష్టతలు మాట్లాడుటకు అవకాశమివ్వగోర్తాను. లేనిచో శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి మాట ఆధార మాటగా అవడం సంభవిస్తోంది. ఇరుకతలెవారి వసంగాలను విని రెవ్వరూ మంత్రులూ సమాధానమివ్వడం న్యాయం కాబట్టి నాగి రెడ్డిగారిని మాట్లాడ సవ్యవలెనని మిక్కు చోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I cannot follow what the hon. Member has spoken."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The hon. Member wants that Sri Nagi Reddi should be given an opportunity to speak."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"It is not a kind of concession to be shown to Sri Nagi Reddi. I will try to give a gist of Mr. Venkateswarlu's good and eloquent speech in a very moderate language . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The Hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to remove the incongruity and unreasonableness in his speech."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, when the Hon. Chief Minister intervenes, it is sometimes taken as the reply on behalf of the Government, with the result the Chair is calling the Mover of the amendment to reply. Let it not be so. He is only intervening in the debate and others will have an opportunity to speak after the Hon. the Chief Minister. It is only after the Hon. the Minister for Revenue replies to the debate, the Chair can call upon the Mover of the amendment to reply. Then only it will give an opportunity for the Members of the Opposition to cover the points raised by the Hon. the Chief Minister and the Minister for Revenue."

26th November 1952]

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ In this particular case, I have nothing to oppose or object to. I submit, it is a dangerous doctrine and, if accepted, it would cut down the privileges of the Chief Minister too much.” (Laughter.)

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ అధ్యక్ష, శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఈ సవరణలోని మాటలు సరిగాలేవని సమాధానమిచ్చారు. సవరణయొక్క ముఖ్యద్దేశాన్ని వారు అంగీకరించినట్లయితే తదనుగుణంగా మాటలను సర్దుబాటు చేయటం నాకభ్యంతరం ఎంతమాత్రం ఉండదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. Conciliation board లో ఒక్క ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగి ఉన్నట్లయితే పేదవారికి కొలుదాదులకు న్యాయంజరిగే అవకాశం తగ్గిపోతుంది న్యాయం కలుగజేయడానికి ఆ ఉద్యోగికి ఎన్నో అవరోధాలు కలుగవచ్చు. ధనవంతులు, పలుకుబడిగలవారు అయిన భూస్వాముల ఒత్తిడిని తట్టుకోవడం అతనికి కష్టసాధ్యమవుతుంది. ఇది మా ఆనుభవాన్ని బట్టి చెప్పుతున్న విషయం. రాజీయమైన, ఇతరమైన పలుకుబడులకు గొంతుపోతు ముందుగానే conciliation board లో భూస్వాముల, కొలుదాదుల ప్రతిఘటన ఉండవలసి కోరుతున్నాను. శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు మాట్లాడుతూ conciliation board లో భూస్వాముల రైతు ప్రతినిధులను పేదనట్లయి ఆదోక కురుక్షేత్రంగా మారుతుందని శలవిచ్చారు ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ కురుక్షేత్రం కాదు, చెజ్జేటిత్ర ఆనెంపి ”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ వారి అప్రీషాయ ప్రకారం conciliation board దాదాపు యుద్ధరంగంగా మారిపోతుందని, ఎటు తీర్పు చెప్పడానికి అవకాశం సన్నగిల్లిపోతుందని, వా పనాదాలకో కాలయాపన జరుగుతుందని బోధపడుతుంది. అది సరికాదని నా భావన. భూస్వాములు, కొలుదాదుల భూములలో తగవులాడుకొని వాటిని కురుక్షేత్రాలగా చేసేకన్న ఒక బోర్డుగా ఏర్పడి వారివారి అప్రీషాయాలను తెలుపుకొని ఏదో ఒక అంగీకారానికి రాడమే భావ్యం. ఈ సవరణను ఆంగీకరించినట్లయితే భూస్వాములు, కొలుదాదులు తలలు పగుల కొట్టుకోవడం, రక్తాలు సారించుకోవడం జరుగదు. వారి మధ్య ఉన్న కలహాలు సర్వత్రా పులద్యానానే సరిదిద్దుకొనే సావకాశం ఏర్పడుతుంది. ఈ సవరణను రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు వ్యతిరేకించడం విచార్యం. పన్నుతం పన్ను క్షాజులెల్ల కొలుదాదుకు ఎట్టి రక్షణ కలుగదు. ఈ విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వంపై ప్రసారలోచించి సవరణను ఆంగీకరించవలసినదిగా కోరుచున్నాను. ”

*SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ అధ్యక్ష, రెవెన్యూ మంత్రిగారు ఈ సవరణలోని సబబును గుర్తించవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను. మనం ఈనాడు తగాదాలనన్నింటిని సర్దుబాటుచేయడానికీ, అవకాలియానికీ తీర్పుకోవలసిన పదే పదే చెబుతున్నాము. కేంద్ర మంత్రులు, రాష్ట్ర మంత్రులు వరకు ఇట్టి సలహాలనే ఇస్తున్నారు. ఆ సూత్రానికి అనుగుణంగానే నేనీ సవరణను తెచ్చాను. కేవలం ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగుల రివక్షణమీదనే ఆధారపడి తీర్పుకోవడం మంచిదికాదు. వరు కక్షలవారి ప్రతినిధులు చెప్పేది జాగ్రత్తగా వివచం, బల్లముందేవారి వివాదాలను పరిష్కరించడం మంచిది. ఏదో arbitrary గా తీర్పు ఇచ్చినందుల్ల ఎక్కి సమాచాలను ఎదుర్కొనలసిన స్థుండనే విషయం రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి తెలియనిదికాదు. నా ఈ సవరణను ఆంగీకరించినందుల్ల conciliation board కురుక్షేత్ర మవుతుందని భయపడవలసిన అక్కర ఏమీలేదు. తగాదాలు ఎక్కడే పరిష్కరింపబడతాయి.

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [26th November 1952]

కాని అవి పొలం గట్టుకు ప్రాకృత. పొలం గట్టుమీద కొట్టాటలు, రక్తపాతం సంభవించడం ఆపుకేయాలంటే నా సవరణను ఆంగీకరించవలసివస్తే అవసరమంటేనే ఉద్దేశం. ఈ విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వంవారు గుర్తించాలి. **Opposition side** నుంచి వచ్చిన సవరణ కనుక వ్యతిరేకిద్దరూనే ఉద్దేశంతోనే కాక, కొలుదార్లకు మేలు కలుగజేయాలనే న్యాయమైన ఉద్దేశంతో ఈ విషయాన్ని పరిశీలించవలసినదని కోరుచున్నాను. **Industrial Tribunals** మీద లైవ్ వాటిలో కార్మికులకు సంబంధించిన మూలమే ట్రిబ్యూనల్స్ పుట్టవని అన్నారు. యదార్థంగా న్యాయం జరుగుతోందా అనే విషయం గమనించండి. పెట్టుబడిదారుల, ఖాస్సీముల పలుకుబడి, బిల్డింగ్ ఎంత హద్దుగా ఉంటాయో ఊహించండి. రాజీయ ప్రయోజనాలను మూలమే ఆశించక, కొలుదారుకు న్యాయం కలుగజేయాలనే సత్సంకల్పంతో ఈ విషయాన్ని గమనించండి అని రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారిని కోరుస్తూ నా సవరణను ప్రభుత్వంవారి ఆమోదానికి వదలుతున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The Hon. Chief Minister has explained it on behalf of the Hon. Minister for Revenue.”

* **THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:**—“Sir, I do not know what is the idea behind the move on the part of the hon. Member representing North Madurai in supporting the amendment. As far as the Mover of the amendment is concerned, I know he has moved it with a good motive. But I may tell him that he is comparatively young and he does not know the effects of this amendment. If this amendment is accepted, the Conciliation Board will turn out to be a mutual wrangling place and no conciliation work would be done.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“I am going to put the amendment of Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah to the vote of the House. The question is—

“For the words “appoint any person . . . Conciliation Officer”, substitute the words “appoint one person on behalf of the Government, one person on behalf of the tenant and one person on behalf of the landowner as Conciliation Board”.”

The amendment was put and declared lost.

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—“I am pressing my amendment to a division.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“I think the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition is not particular about the amendment.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“Not particular, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The amendment is lost. Now, Sri Kolkebail will move his amendment.”

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

“For the words “appoint any person”, substitute the words “appoint any Senior Subordinate Judge.””

“My amendment is very simple and innocuous . . .”

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—“Sir, I am pressing my amendment to a division.”

26th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—" Will the hon. Member go to the Leader of the Opposition and he will tell him what the position is."

* SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL:—" Sir, in explaining my motion I want to point out that in the Bill, under Clause 14, the framers of the Bill want to oust the jurisdiction of civil courts in matters covered by this measure. The other day, the Hon. the Chief Minister threatened that he would withdraw the Bill if the Members wanted to give civil courts jurisdiction in these matters. Sir, I do not want him to withdraw the Bill on this score. But I suggest to him a *via media* and that is, instead of having as Conciliation Officer a Tahsildar or Revenue Divisional Officer, who is not well-versed in law, it is better to have a senior Subordinate Judge. Sir, my amendment is a very innocuous one and so I expect it will be accepted by the Government."

SRI G. BAPANAYYA:—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second the amendment, and in seconding it, I submit that the term 'any person' is a very vague one, and that for a person to be a conciliation officer he should be an officer of some standing."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" Sir, in the context of appointment of Conciliation Officers this is not a practical proposition and so I oppose the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—" The question is—

'For the words "appoint any person", substitute the words "appoint any senior Subordinate Judge."'

The amendment was lost.

Clause 4 was put and carried.

Clause 5.

MR. SPEAKER:—" The motion is—

'That Clause 5 do stand part of the Bill.'

Mr. S. S. Kolkebail cannot move his amendment under this clause, for it is a consequential amendment to his previous amendment, and as that was lost he cannot move his amendment here."

* SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL:—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, Clause 5 deals with the court of appeal, while the previous one deals with the court of original jurisdiction. So the two are different; and therefore I submit my amendment under this clause is not a consequential amendment. Therefore, Sir, I beg to move—

'For the words "Revenue Court which shall be presided over by an officer not below the rank of a Revenue Divisional Officer", substitute the words "Revenue Court which shall be presided over by a Judge not below the rank of a senior Subordinate Judge."'

I only request that at least in the matter of appeal a senior Subordinate Judge may be appointed instead of a Revenue Divisional Officer."

SRI N. V. L. NARASIMHA RAO:—" I second it."

[26th November 1952]

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"On a point of information, Sir, I want to know if Mr. Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah was conciliated about his pressing his motion to a division." (Laughter.)

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I oppose the amendment on the same grounds I advanced with regard to the previous amendment, namely, it will not be a workable one. A Revenue Divisional Officer will be all right for this work."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—"

'For the words "Revenue Court which shall be presided over by an officer not below the rank of a Revenue Divisional officer" substitute the words "Revenue Court which shall be presided over by a Judge not below the rank of a senior Sub-ordinate Judge."'

The amendment was lost.

4 p.m. SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

'After the words "a Revenue Court", insert the words "consisting of one person on behalf of the Government, one person on behalf of the tenant and one person on behalf of the landowner."'

"అనే విషయము వర్షించవలసిన సవరణను ఉద్దేశించుచున్నాను. బిల్లులో రెవిన్యూ కోర్టు అని ఉండవలసివచ్చును. దీనిని మార్పుచేయు విషయములలో ఆర్థిక మంత్రి సుబ్రహ్మణ్యంగారు నా సవరణ ఆమోదిస్తారని ఆశంకంబున్నాను. ఎందు చేతనంటే సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ రిపోర్టులో రెవిన్యూ వ్యవహారములన్నియు conciliation board వల్ల విచారపరిచబడునని వున్నది. యీ conciliation board అంటే అందులో గవర్నమెంటు ఆఫీసరును నియమించవలసివచ్చును. ఇక రాఫువేరిద రావు కమిటీ రిపోర్టులోనూడా అలాగే conciliation board ను నియమించి రెవిన్యూ వ్యవహారములను పరిష్కరించుకోవచ్చునని ఉన్నది. మహారాష్ట్ర కమిటీ రిపోర్టులోనూడా అలాగే సేవార్లు చేశారు. అట్లాంటిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు యిప్పుడు కన్సిలియేషన్ ఆఫీసరు అనేదానికి బదులు ఒక conciliation బోర్డు ఎందుకు వేయవలసివచ్చునని అనుకున్నాను. ఈ రెవిన్యూ కోర్టును సర్దుబాటుచేయవలసి ఒక గవర్నమెంటు తీర్పునను, ఛాన్సలరీ తరపున ఒకరున్నా. ఈ దారు తరపున ఒకరున్నా వేస్తే బాగుంటుందని నా ఆగ్రిమెంటున్నది. అట్లాంటిప్పుడు ఛాన్సలరీ ములు కోర్టు, litigation ఆధారం చేసుకొని, యీ కౌంటిదాన్లను బాంకులనుండి తరమివేయకుండా ఉండటానికి వీలంటుంది. నా ఆగ్రిమెంటును యీ Conci-
liation boardను యేర్పరిచి దానియొక్క తీర్పు final గా చేయడం నుంచి. ఇది వరకూ గవర్నమెంటు యీ జమీందారీ ఆర్టు వ్యాసు చేసినప్పుడు ట్రిబ్యూనల్ విచారణ చేశారేగాని, కోర్టుకు finality యిచ్చారు యిందులో జమీందారీలు, ఆగ్రహారాలు, యీ ట్రిబ్యూనల్స్ finality యిచ్చకుండా చేసినందున యివ్వియ సర్వనాశనం చేశారు. ఈ ట్రిబ్యూనల్స్ finality యిచ్చకపోవడంవల్ల, ట్రిబ్యూనల్ వద్ద వ్యతిరేక తీర్పుయిస్తే, కోర్టులో అనుకూల తీర్పు యివ్వడం, ట్రిబ్యూనల్ వద్ద అనుకూల తీర్పు యిస్తే కోర్టులో వ్యతిరేక తీర్పు యివ్వడంవల్ల, అనేక తికమకలు జరిగి

26th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

రైతాంగం నష్టపడింది. అందువల్ల నా సవరణ ప్రకారం ఒక Conciliation Board ఏర్పాటుచేసి, దానిలో ప్రభుత్వము తరఫున ఒకరిని, Land holder తరఫున ఒకరిని, కౌలుదారు తరఫున ఒకరినివేసి, ఆ బోర్డుయొక్క తీర్పు final గా చేస్తే, litigationకు సావకాశం లేకుండా త్వరలో పరిష్కారము జరగవచ్చును. అట్లు చేయనియెడల యీ సుబ్బన్యాయ కమిటీ సేపార్సులు, కుమారపు కమిటీ సేపార్సులుచేసి ప్రయోజనమేమిటి? యీ సేపార్సులను అంగీకరింపకపోతే, వాటిని త్రోసివేసినట్లే! అందువల్ల ప్రజాక్షేమం కోరిక ప్రభుత్వము ఆయితే నా సవరణను ఆమోదిస్తారని ఆసీస్తున్నాను.”

SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI:—“ I second the amendment.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Sri V. Sri Krishna and Sri D. Seetharamiah may speak on this amendment. Their amendments^a are almost on similar lines to this amendment and so they may speak on Mr. Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah's amendment. They need not move their amendments.”

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—“ Sir, నా amendment ప్రతి భూస్వామ్యుని 1000 acre amendment రెండు ఒకటికాదని నా విజ్ఞప్తి. ఎందుచేతనంటే నేను చెప్పేది

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The difference is only a minor one, and so let us not waste the time of the House by asking each Member to move his amendment. Let us consider them all to have been moved and the discussion may proceed on all the amendments.”

* SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—“ అధ్యక్షా, ఈ amendments అన్నియు ఒకటికాదని నా విజ్ఞప్తి. ఎందుచేతనంటే, నా amendment ప్రతి భూస్వామికి, కౌలుదారుకు, వస్త్రయాలకు ఒక్కొక్క ప్రతినిధిని వేయించాలని కాదు. మొత్తము మీద కౌలుదారి రైతాంగానికి, భూస్వాములకు, వస్త్రయాలకు అందరికీ ఒక ad hoc tribunal వేసి అందులో representation ఉండాలని నేను amendment ను move చేస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా యీ amendment move చేస్తున్నప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారి దృష్టికి రెండు ముఖ్య విషయాలు తీసుకురావాలని నా ఉద్దేశ్యము. ప్రభుత్వం ఒక వైపు కౌలుదార్ల రక్షణకంటూ బిల్లు ప్రతిపాదిస్తూనే మరోవైపు ఇలాంటి క్లాజుల ద్వారా అసలు భుద్దేశ్యానికి తూట్లు పొడుస్తున్నదని నా విశ్వాసం. ముఖ్యంగా యీ కౌలుదారి చట్టము నిజంగా కౌలుదార్లకు భూస్వాములకు మధ్య జరిగే తగాదాల పరిష్కారములో న్యాయం జరగాలంటే, నేను కోరే ad hoc tribunal ను వేసి అందులో ఒక్కొక్క పార్టీయొక్క representative ను వేస్తే వారి అందరికీ యీ తగాదాల న్యాయంగా పరిష్కారమవునని ఛార్జ్ ము ఉండగలదని నా ఉద్దేశ్యము. రెండవ విషయం—Select Committee లో వచ్చినప్పుడు, ప్రధాన మంత్రి ‘apartisan

^a SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—For the words “a Revenue Court . . . Revenue Divisional Officer” substitute the following words:—

“ad hoc tribunal with the Revenue Divisional Officer as the Chairman and representatives of landowners, tenants and pannaityals as members.”

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“Add at the end the words ‘The Revenue Court shall consist of equal number of representatives of landlords and tenants or pannaityals and will be appointed by the disputing parties’.”

[Sri V. Sri Krishna] [26th November 1952]

cannot be a good judge' అని కారణం చెప్పి దీన్ని త్రోసివేయటం జరిగింది. కుమారప్ప కమిటీలో Tribunal వేయాలని సిఫార్సు చేయబడింది. దాన్ని Special Officer Raghavendra Rao సుబహ్మణ్యం కమిటీవారు బలపరుచియున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వమువారు వేసిన Sub-Committees, Special Officer రాఘవేంద్రరావుగార్ల సిఫార్సులుగూడా ఆమోదించ నిరాకరిస్తున్నారు. Revenue Divisional Officer ను వేసే సూచన ఆమోదించారు. ఇది ప్రకటమైన పద్ధతికాదు. పైగా ఈ Conciliation Officer తీర్పుగూడా final అంటున్నారు. అట్లాంటప్పుడు కొలుదాల్ల, ఘాస్వాముల చుట్టూ తగాదాల పరిష్కారములు న్యాయముగా జరగవు. గనుక, యీ ప్రభుత్వమువారు చేసే clause ను ఆమోదించితే వాళ్లకు ఆన్యాయము చేసినట్లు అవుతుంది. ప్రభుత్వము వారు న్యాయమైన దృష్టితో యీ విషయము పరిశీలించి ad hoc tribunal వేసే నా సవరణను ఆమోదించమని కోరుతున్నాను."

*SRI K. SUBBA REDDI :—“అధ్యక్ష, శ్రీ కృష్ణగారు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణను నేను హృదయపూర్వకంగా బలపరుస్తున్నాను. కొలుదాల్ల పన్నయాళ్ల రత్నశాస్త్రి యీ చిల్ల తేబడినదనే విషయం వాస్తవమని ఎంతబడాలంటే ఈ సవరణను ప్రభుత్వము వారు అంగీకరించాలి. Revenue Divisional Officer ఒక్కరితోనే కూడుకున్న రెవిన్యూ Court వల్ల వేదవారైన కొలుదాల్లకు పన్నయాళ్లకు న్యాయం జరుగుతుందనే విషయం అనుమానాస్పదం. ఈ నాడు ధకమున్నవానికి అనుకూలంగా అధికారుల అధికారాలు ఉంటున్నాయనే విషయం అందరికీ తెలిసినట్టిదే. కొలుదాల్ల పన్నయాళ్ల ఘాస్వాముల ప్రతిఘటనగూడా రెవిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసులో చాలు రెవిన్యూ కోర్టులో ఉన్నట్లయితే ఉభయపక్షాలవారి వాదనను విని న్యాయంకలగ జేయటానికి అవకాశం పెచ్చుగా ఉంటుంది. కాబట్టి ఒక్క ప్రభుత్వ ఉద్యోగుల విచక్షణా దృష్టికే ఈ విషయాన్ని వదలివేయక ఇరుపక్కలవారి ప్రతిఘటనల కోర్టును ఏర్పాటు చేయవలసిందని ప్రభుత్వమువారిని తిరిగి కోరుతున్నాను. శ్రీ కృష్ణగారి సవరణలోని ఆశయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వమువారు గుర్తొరని ఆశిస్తున్నాను.”

*SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“అధ్యక్ష, రెవిన్యూ కోర్టులో Revenue Divisional Officer అవసరమే కాకుండా ఆ కోర్టులో యింకను రైతులయొక్క పన్నయాలయొక్క ప్రతిఘటన, ఘాస్వాములయొక్క ప్రతిఘటనగూడా ఉండడము అవసరమే. లేకపోతే రైతులకు, పన్నయాలకు ఆన్యాయము జరుగుతుందని మా భయం, రైతులందరి భయంకూడా. ఎందుకంటే యీ రెవిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసర్లు మేజిస్ట్రేటులుగా ఉండి ఆన్యాయముచేసిన కేసులు ఎన్నో ఉన్నవి వీరు యిచ్చిన తీర్పులు ఎన్నో హాకోట్లోను, పెషన్సు కోర్టులోనూ సరియైనవి కావని త్రోసివేయడమిది. ఇదంతా అందరికీ తెలిసిన విషయమే. ఉదాహరణకు చిత్తూరుజిల్లా పల్లనేరు తాలూకా, కంగుంది యిట్టేటుకు చెందిన జోయన బల్లి యినాం రైతుల కేసును చూడండి. ఈ కేసును విచారించిన రెవిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసరు రైతులపైన 107 అక్షను జారీచేసి వారిపందరిని జామీను ఆరెస్టులో పెట్టాడు. ఇటీవలనే వారందరికీ జామీను ఇవ్వబడేసాడు. ఇనాందాల్లు, వాం రోడిలు యీ రైతుల స్త్రీలను మానభంగము చేశారు. రైతులను చావచాదారు. ఇదంతా యీ యినాందాల్లు, ఘాస్వాములు ఈ Revenue Divisional Officer ను కట్టుకుని చేసినదే. ఈ Revenue Court ఆనబడే ఈ రెవిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసర్లు ఘాస్వాములకు లోబడి పోయి వారు చెప్పినట్లు సటింపవచ్చు. అందువల్లనే యిటువంటి అక్రమాలు జరగకుండా, నేను నా సవరణను ప్రవేశపెట్టాను. అందువల్ల నా సవరణ ప్రకారము

26th November 1952] [Sri D. Seetharamiah]

conciliation బోర్డు అసగా, ప్రభుత్వ ప్రతినిధి చేర్చుకొనున్నా, ఘాస్వాముల యొక్కయు రైతులయొక్క ప్రతినిధులు అందులో సభ్యులుగా ఉండాలి. ఈ విధముగా ఘాస్వాముల, రైతుల మధ్య వచ్చు తగాదాలను పరిష్కరించాలని కోరుతున్నాను కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ విషయము గురించి నా సవరణను ఆంగీకరించాలి. ఇదే సందర్భములో మరొకవిషయము తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఇది నా అనుభవములో జరిగియున్న విషయము. అదేమిటంటే, 1938 వ సంవత్సరములో మా చితూరు జిల్లా, మదనపల్లి తాలూకాకు చెందిన టి. చదుం శ్రుదాహరణ 1938 వ సంవత్సరములో యీ గ్రామములో యీ నాందార్లకు, రైతులకు మధ్య పెద్ద తగాదాలు వచ్చినవి. తరువాతను కాపాడుకొనుటకై రైతులు సమ్మతించారు. అట్టి సందర్భములో యీ రైతులను ఘాములనుండి తరిమి వేయటానికి ఇనాందార్లు ప్రయత్నముచేశారు. రైతులపై యివ్వు అక్రమాలు జరిపించారు. అప్పుడు యీనాందార్లు రైతుల ప్రతినిధులతోను, జిల్లా కలెక్టరుతోను ఒక conciliation బోర్డు యేర్పడింది. దాని ప్రకారము కండిన పంటలో మూడింట రెండు భాగాలు రైతులకు యిచ్చేటట్లు నిర్ణయించబడి తగాదా నులభముగా పరిష్కరించబడింది. కాని జిల్లా కలెక్టరు ఒక్కడే conciliation చేసియున్నట్లుంటే, ఆ తగాదా న్యాయరీతిగా పరిష్కారము అయిఉండేదికాదు. యీనాందార్లు ధనవంతులు అగుటచేత వారికి అయ్యణాబడి, యీ విషయములో ఎంతో అన్యాయపు ఛీర్పు యిచ్చి ఉండేవాడు. గనుక ఘాస్వాములకు రైతులకు మధ్య తగాదాలు అందలి ప్రతినిధులతో conciliation బోర్డుగా ఏర్పడి పరిష్కరించబడితే, ఉభయాలకు న్యాయమే జరుగునుగాని అన్యాయానికి చోటుఉండదు. కనుక ప్రభుత్వమువారిని, నా సవరణను ఆంగీకరించమని కోరుతున్నాను.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like 4 p.m. to point out . . . ”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I suppose the hon. Member is seconding the amendment of Sri D. Seetharamiah.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Yes, Sir. In seconding this amendment, I would like to point out that this amendment should not be treated on a par with the amendment that was moved in respect of the clause relating to Conciliation Officers. Under this Bill, the Revenue Divisional Officer is given absolute powers. His decision is not subject to any revision by any authority. It may be that the Government may have their fullest confidence in the Revenue Divisional Officers but, we on this side must make it very clear that we have not got that amount of confidence in the Revenue Divisional Officers. In spite of the fact that the Hon. the Chief Minister might say that he has got great faith in seeing to it that class bias does not play any part in human affairs, we have got to take into account the state of affairs as it exists today. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that temptations are there; otherwise, if temptations were not there and, if all the people in the Government service were free from falling victims to these temptations, we will not be hearing so much of corruption in the various departments. I am not going into this question at all but here is the fact that a lot of temptation will be placed before the Revenue Divisional Officers for, after all, we deal with two 4-10 p.m.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [26th November 1952]

parties here. One party is a very powerful party which owns hundreds of thousands of acres of land and the income that it can derive from that land. It is therefore very easy for that party to tempt the Revenue Divisional Officers. I am not saying that the generality of Revenue Divisional Officers in this State are corrupt of any such thing. It is far from my intention but what I do submit is that temptations will be placed before the Revenue Divisional Officers and one cannot say that all of them will be completely free from corruption. This is one aspect of the question.

“ Then there is such a thing as what is called an ‘ outlook ’ also. In spite of the fact that one might say that there is such a thing as justice and holding the balance even between the two parties, there is also the peoples’ mentality. The peoples’ outlook is corroded by the particular circumstances in which they are brought up and also by their entire upbringing. A certain outlook and a certain mentality develop as a result of this, and, unfortunately today it so happens that in the society in which we find ourselves most of the officials have developed a particular outlook and are biased in favour of the landowners and against the peasants. This is a fact. After all, when we go to a Court, the first question that is put to every witness is, ‘ How much land revenue do you pay, and what property do you hold? ’ as if the fact that he holds a good deal of property will mean that the evidence that he gives will correspond to the truth. Unfortunately that system is still there and we cannot get over it. Therefore, so long as the basis of society is exactly what it is to-day, we cannot shut our eyes to this fact, and that is why we say that you should not make these officials all powerful in respect of the relations between landlords and tenants, and particularly so when these officials are clothed with extreme powers under Clause 10 in the succeeding portions of the Bill. These officials can decide whether a particular tenant has cared for the land or has not done this thing or that thing and for any and every reason they can say today that the tenant should be evicted. They could do so even for political reasons. After all, there is the political bias also. They cannot look at problems without political bias, for today they are biased against a certain political party. If a tenant happens to have particular political leanings, that itself might go against him. Whether the officer does it consciously or unconsciously, his political bias, at any rate, corrodes his outlook. Therefore, taking into consideration all things,—I am not saying that absolute justice is ever possible—in order to minimise the hardships and to see that the peasants and the poorer sections of the people are not victimised today by this kind of bias on the part of the Revenue Officials, a method must be found by which they will be able to get justice to the extent that is possible.

“ This amendment lays down that where Government are making the Revenue Divisional Officer the absolute authority in matters regarding relations between the landlords and the tenants, at least in such cases, you have got to substitute for the Revenue

26th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

Divisional Officer some other machinery that will see to it that proper canons are set up, proper rules are evolved and that proper understanding takes place between both the parties. I therefore say that it is a very reasonable amendment and, if the Government are really interested in seeing that injustice is not rendered to the people, they should have no hesitation whatsoever in coming forward and accepting this amendment; otherwise, I should think that a different conclusion will have to be drawn."

*SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ అధ్యక్ష, నేను ఈ amendment ను బలపరచున్నాను. అయితే ఒక విషయము మౌతము ముందు చెప్పవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. ఇంతకుముందు క్రిందిక్షాజాలవర్గంలోనే, వివాదాలవిషయంలో రైతులయొక్క ప్రతినిధి ఉండాలని మేము కోరాము. కాని ప్రభుత్వము అసూయనకు సమాధానము చెప్పకుండానే తమకు మెజారిటీ ఉన్నదనే ఉద్దేశ్యంతో, మరీ ఉద్దేశ్యంతోగాని మాకు సమాధానము చెప్పకనే వోటుకు పెట్టి పాస్ చేయడం జరిగింది. కనుక తిరిగి ఈ విషయమున అనేక సమస్యలు వారిముందు పెట్టుతున్నాము అందువల్ల ఈ రెవిన్యూ కోర్టులో Pannaiyal యొక్క, tenants యొక్క, మరియు landholders యొక్క ప్రతినిధులు ఉండవలసిన అవసరము ఎంతైనా ఉన్నదని చెప్పుచున్నాను. అయితే శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఈ సందర్భంలో ఇంకొక విషయము చెప్పారు. ఈ మాదిరి వీరందరి తరఫున ఆసగా పార్టీలందరి తరఫున ప్రతినిధులు న్నట్లుంటే ఈ court ఏ ముద్రాను Legislative Assembly గానో లేక ఒక select committee గానో తయారు అవుతుందని చెప్పారు. ఈ సందర్భమున వారికి ఒక విషయాన్ని జ్ఞప్తికి తెచ్చున్నాను. ముద్రానుల murder case లు వచ్చినప్పుడు కూడా, ఒక jury ని పెట్టి, ఆ jury యొక్క నిర్ణయాన్ని తీసుకోవడం జరుగుతుందనే విషయము రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి తెలుసును. (Interruption by Hon. Sri Subramaniam.) ముద్రానులకు గారికి తొందరపడడం అలవాటు. కొంచెము ఓపిక గా ఉంటే విషయము ఆర్థమవుతుంది. కాని వారు ఇంకా ఓపిక అలవాటు చేసుకోలేదు. అందువల్ల నేను చెప్పేది విమోచింపే ఈ Jury లో ఉన్న representatives వలనే ఈ భూస్వాములయొక్క tenants యొక్క pannaiyals యొక్క representatives ఈ వివాదాల పరిష్కారానికి ఉండవలసిందే అని అడుగుతున్నాను. Jury లో వివిధంగా public opinion ను తెలుసుకొంటారో అదేవిధంగానే ఇక్కడ కూడా అందరి హక్కులను సహదృష్టితో పరిశీలించేందుకును విచారించేందుకును అన్ని పార్టీలవారికి representatives ఉండవలసిందే అని అనలు Judges కూడా కొన్ని సందర్భాలలో murder cases లో వాటిలో public opinion ఎట్లా ఉంటుందో అని తెలుసుకోవలసి యుంటుంది. ఇంక mufassal అయితే murder cases లో Jury అభిప్రాయాన్ని దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొనే కేసులను పరిశీలిస్తారనేదాన్ని చూస్తున్నాము. ఈ విధానము బ్రిటిష్ ప్రభుత్వము కూడా అనుసరిస్తూ వచ్చియుండినదే. ఈ రోజుకు కూడా జరుగుచున్నది. కనుక ఈ వివాదాల విషయములలో కూడా అందరి హక్కులను న్యాయా న్యాయాలను సరిగా తెలుసుకొని పరిశీలించి పరిష్కారం చేసుకోవడానికి pannaiyals యొక్కయు tenants యొక్కయు, భూస్వాములయొక్కయు ప్రతినిధులు ఉండేటప్పుడు వివిధంగా ఆ కోర్టు, రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు చెప్పినట్లు, ఒక కురుక్షేత్రంలాగా అవుతుందో నాకు బోధపడడం లేదు. ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member must finish his speech.”

*SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“నాకింతకొంతమేము time కావాలని ప్రార్థిస్తున్నాను. ఇది ముఖ్యమైన విషయము. అందువల్ల, ఈ ప్రజాభి

[Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu] [26th November 1952]

ప్రాయాన్ని తెలుసుకొనేటటువంటి అలవాటు ఇప్పుడు కొత్తగా వచ్చిందిగాను. ఇతర అన్ని వ్యవహారాలలోను అనేక రకాలైన రాజకీయ విషయాలలోనూ, public opinion రాబట్టుకొనుట చూస్తున్నాము. ఇటువంటి agrarian వివాదాలలో కూడ tribunals అనగా అందరియొక్క representatives ఉండవలసిన రాసు వేద్రారావు కమిటీయన్నూ, మరియు కుమారప్ప కమిటీయన్నూ కూడ చెప్పినవి. కనుక దీనిలో కూడ అటువంటి న్యాయసమ్మతమైన అనుకూలాన్ని కలుగజేయవలసిన అవసరమంతైనా ఉన్నది. అందువల్ల కాంగ్రెస్ పార్టీ వారందరుకూడ ఈ సవరింబాడైన ముఖ్యమైనటువంటి విషయాన్ని గమనించి దీనిని ఆమోదించడానికి తమకు స్వేచ్ఛగా వోటింగు హక్కు ఇవ్వవలసిందని వారి నాయకులను అడిగి దీనిని అందరు ఆమోదించవలసిన కోరుచున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“Before I call upon the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue to reply, I wish to say a few words about the procedure of the House. There is a wrong impression in the minds of some Members. Simply because they have given notice of amendments, it does not mean that the Speaker is bound to call each and every amendment. There is what is known as the ‘Kangaroo’ method. The Speaker has got the power to select some amendments, allow one or two speeches on them and declare the rest as out of order. I am saying this because I have seen a number of similar amendments given notice of by Members and there appears to be an impression that every member should speak on every amendment. It is not possible, and let me also tell the House that, if the Speaker considers he has given enough time to a particular amendment, he can put it to the vote of the House.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“With regard to what you have been pleased to say, I submit that we are always in general agreement with what you say and are willing to abide by your orders.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“These are not orders. I was only giving out the procedure to be adopted.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“Sir, I submit that when amendments are of a similar nature the Chair has got the right to select the amendments.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“That is known as the ‘kangaroo’ method.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“No doubt, Sir, an ‘Australian gentleman’ has been introduced into our procedure with a view to simplify it. It is a fact, Sir, that this procedure can be put into effect if there are more than a hundred amendments. After all, all the amendments put together in the present case do not cover even 9 pages, and you are pleased to say that every member cannot get an opportunity. Only about 7 or 8 persons are taking part.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“But, I have seen my old Friend, Sri P. Venkateswarlu, speaking on every amendment.”

26th November 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"It is so because Sri P. Venkateswarlu is the person who is most interested in this subject."

*** SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—**"ఇప్పుడు నేను మాట్లాడినది మీకు అర్థం కావడంపై మీరే విధంగా చెప్పుచున్నారు, కాని మీరు అర్థం చేసుకొనినట్లుంటే అలా మాట్లాడరు. ఎందుకైతే నేను తీసుకొనివచ్చిన amendments కొత్త points మీదనే ఉంటున్నాయి. నేను మాట్లాడిందికూడా కొత్త points తోనే మాట్లాడాను. కావలసినట్లే మీరు నేను మాట్లాడినదానిని translate చేయించుకొని తెలుసుకోవచ్చును. కనుక అలాంటి ఉద్దేశ్యము పెట్టుకోకూడదని ప్రార్థిస్తున్నాను."

4-20
p.m.

SRI K. V. RAMESAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, in supporting the amendment, I wish to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that when Conciliation Boards are formed non-officials are recruited to help the Conciliation Officer. Some such arrangement can easily be made with regard to the constitution of Revenue Courts also. I submit, Sir, that the amendment simply suggests the appointment of one representative on behalf of the landowner and one representative on behalf of the tenant to help the Revenue Divisional Officer, in order to arrive at a just settlement."

*** THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:**—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I intervene without interfering with the right of reply of the various people who have moved their amendments? The position has not, I submit, been properly understood or it is deliberately ignored. The Revenue Court is a Court just to take the law which we lay down now into account and the facts which will be proved and give a decision. It has nothing whatsoever by way of a parallel with the Industrial Tribunals where there is no such thing as proved facts, but the administration, management and other things have to be taken into account. Here the case is, the clauses that we now pass with the consent of the House and which will become law have to be applied to the facts placed there on sworn evidence. Therefore, I submit that it is impossible for plaintiff and defendant to sit in judgment over their own cases. The whole scheme is wrongly conceived."

"As regards the other suggestion in the remaining two amendments, namely, that two partisans—not persons interested in the plaintiff and the defendant, but in the landlords as a class and the tenants as a class—should sit along with the Revenue Divisional Officer, it only means that we wish to convert Courts in India into class tribunals, which I submit is not the scheme either of the Constitution or of this law."

*** SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:**—"అధ్యక్షా, ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారికి ఈ tribunals ఉండవలసిన సలహా అసలు ఎవరినుండి వచ్చిందో చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఇది పార్టీశాసిత వివాదాలకు మాత్రమే వాడుతారని అన్నారు. ఇది పార్టీశాసిత వివాదాలకు కాకుండా వ్యవసాయక వివాదాలకు కూడా అన్వయించవలసిన అంతున్నాం. ఇది మేము ఈనాడు చెప్పేటటువంటి విషయము కాదు. స్పృహకల్పం"

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [26th November 1952]

కమిటీ రిపోర్టులో 'Land tribunals consisting of a Revenue Divisional Officer as the Chairman with representatives of landholders and tenants . . . ' అని ఆ కమిటీవారి చెప్పియున్నారు. మేము ఆ ఆర్గిచాయన్నే ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వ దృష్టికి తెస్తున్నప్పుడు, వారెందుకు దీనిని అంగీకరించడం లేదో అర్థం కాదు. ఇందులో తప్పు ఎవరిదో తెలియదు. ఆసలు గవర్నమెంటు appoint చేసినటు వంటి సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీయే నశ్వరచేసిందా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. అంతేకాకుండా కుమారప్ప కమిటీ రిపోర్టు ప్రాసినప్పుడు కూడా land tribunals వల్ల ఉపయోగమున్నది అవి ఉండవలెననే వాదించారు. ఈ విషయాన్ని కూడా ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు గమనించవలసి యుంటుంది అయితే ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు ఇంకొకవాదన తీసుకువచ్చారు. ఈ విధంగా అందరి representatives ను నియంత్రించినట్లయితే, ఇది వర్గపోరాటాలకు దారితీస్తుందని వేచారు. ఇది సరియైన ఆర్గిచాయము కాదు. ఆసలు ఈ amendment తీసుకువచ్చినది ఇటువంటి తగాదాలు లేకుండా చేయు ఉద్దేశ్యము తోనేగాని మరో ఉద్దేశ్యంతోనేగాదు. భూస్వాముల యొక్క tenants యొక్క అందరియొక్క హక్కులను, నాయాన్యాయములను సరిగా తెలుసుకొని వారి తగాదాలను పరిష్కారం చేయడానికే ఈ సవరణ తీసుకు రాబడినప్పుడు, దీనివల్ల వర్గ పోరాటాలు ఎట్లు రాగలవో అర్థం కావడంలేదు. మేము ఈవిధంగా ఇటువంటి సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నామంటే, మేము ఒక trusteeship మీద, హృదయపరివర్తనమీద, సిద్ధాంతరీత్యా ఆలోచిస్తున్నామని లేదా అనే విషయాన్ని గమనించవలసియుంటుంది. ఇటువంటి విషయాలతోనేగాదు, ఇంకా గొప్ప గొప్ప అంతర్జాతీయ విషయాలతోనూడ, మనము కమిటీలకుకట్టుబడి, వాటిద్వారా తగాదాలను పరిష్కారంచేసుకోనుచుండుట లేదా అనే విషయాన్ని కూడా వారు గ్రహించవలసి యుంటుంది. దీనిని ప్రభుత్వముకూడ బిచ్చుకుంటుందనే ఆనాటాను. కనుక trustee సిద్ధాంతాన్ని కోరేటటువంటి ప్రభుత్వము, న్యాయ సత్తువగా, అందరి హక్కులను సమానంగా పరిశీలించి వివాదాలను పరిష్కరించేందుకు ఏటాండేటట్లుగా మేము ఈ సలహాలను ఇస్తున్నామంటేనప్పుడు, ఇది ఏ విధంగా class struggles కు దారితీస్తుందని వారు ఉద్దేశపడుతున్నారో తెలియదు. ఈ విషయాన్ని ఇప్పుడు మేము కొత్తగా చెప్పచున్నదిగాదు. ఇవరలో గవర్నమెంటువారు appoint చేసిన Subramaniam Committee వారు చెప్పినటువంటిదేగాని మేము ఇప్పుడు కొత్తగా చెప్పుచుండుటలేదు కనుక దీనిని ఉపయోగపడుతున్నట్లుగానే ఈ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీవారు ఇచ్చినటువంటి సలహానే, ప్రభుత్వము అంగీకరించవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను. అదే మా సవరణయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము."

MR. SPEAKER:—"May I know whether the hon. Member Sri V. Sri Krishna is going to say anything?"

* SRI V. SRI KRISHNA: ... "అధ్యక్షా, ఈ విధముగా భూస్వాములకున్న, tenants కున్న ప్రతినిధులను ఏర్పాటుచేయడంవల్ల వర్గలహాలు వస్తాయని ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు అంటున్నారు ఆసలు ప్రభుత్వం ఎర్రాలకతితమయినదిగాదని, బోరిడి వర్గాల రక్షణలని గుర్తించబట్టి రైతులకు రక్షణకలిగించాలనే ఉద్దేశ్యంతోనే మేమీ సవరణను తీసుకువచ్చామని ప్రభుత్వంవారు గుర్తించవలసియుంటుంది. అందరి హక్కులు సరిగా తెలుసుకొని పరిష్కారంచేయడానికే ఈ ప్రతినిధులు తోడ్పడు తారు. అనికాకుండా అందరి తరఫున ప్రతినిధులు లేనప్పుడు, బలమైనటువంటి ఒకేవర్గమునకే మేలుజరిగి తక్కినవారికి అన్యాయము జరుగుతుంది. అందరి తరఫున

26th November 1952] [Sri V. Sri Krishna]

ప్రతినిధులున్నప్పుడు ఈలాంటి ఆక్రమం జరగడానికి వీలుండదు. ఈ ఉద్దేశ్యంతోనే మేము ఈ సవరణను తీసుకువచ్చాము. కాబట్టి కాలకు సాగుబడిచేస్తున్న రైతులు వారి హక్కులను నిలబెట్టుకొని, వారికి న్యాయముజరగాలంటే, ప్రభుత్వముకిని అంగీకరించాలనియన్నదని కోరుతున్నాను.

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ అధ్యక్ష, ఈ రెవిన్యూ కమిషన్ డివిజన్ వర్గాలకు ప్రతినిధులండనునది వర్తమానాలకు దారితీస్తుందని ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు సెలవిచ్చారు. అది సరియైనట్లైతే చాలా యముగా దని చెప్పవచ్చును ఎందుకనగా, ఈ వివిధ వర్గాలకు ప్రతినిధులున్నప్పుడే వీరి దరుకలిసి సమయొక్క వాదనలను రెవిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసరు (Revenue Divisional Officer) కు తెలియజేయడంవల్ల, ఆయన సరియైనటువంటి నిర్ణయానికిరాగలడు. ఏ తగాదాలలోగాని, సమస్యలలోగాని అన్ని వర్గాలకు ప్రతినిధులున్నప్పుడే న్యాయము జరుగగలదు. ఇప్పుడు ఈ శాసనసభలో కూడా మంత్రి వర్గము, వ్యతిరేకము అని రెండుపక్షాలున్నాయి. అందరుకలిసి వారివారి ఆధిపత్యాలను సరిగా తెలియజేసినప్పుడు, ఏది సరియైనదో ఏది సరియైనదో దాని తో సమకాలిని నిర్ణయించేందుకు వీలుంటుంది. అలాగే రెవిన్యూ కోర్టులలోగూడ సరియైనటువంటి పరిష్కారము, న్యాయము జరగాలంటే కట్టచారులైన రైతుల, పన్నయాలల, భూస్వాములయొక్క ప్రతినిధులండడము అవసరము. వీరిందరుకలిసి న్యాయంగా పరిష్కరించేందుకే తోడ్పడతారు. అలాంటప్పుడు ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు అన్నట్లు ఇదివరకలక్షలకు ఏరితిగా దారితీస్తుందో అర్థంకావడంలేదు అదీకాకుండా, జిల్లా జడ్జిలకోర్టులలోను, ఇంకా ఇతర కోర్టులలోనుగూడా, అన్ని విషయాలు సరిగా తెలుసుకొనేందుకు (Juries) జూరీమను నియమిస్తున్నారు. అది చట్టవిరుద్ధమే, లేక కాన్స్టిట్యూషనుకు (Constitution) కు విరుద్ధమే, అని అడుగుతున్నాను. అది చట్టానికిమాత్రము విరుద్ధమేకాదు. అలాంటప్పుడు రెవిన్యూ కోర్టులలోగూడ ఈ ప్రతినిధులండడము Constitution కు విరుద్ధమేకానరదు. అంతే కాకుండా జూరీస్ (Juries) ఏ విధముగా అయితే న్యాయముచేయవచ్చునో అదే విధముగా, అదేవిధంగానే ఈ ప్రతినిధులుగూడ సరియైనటువంటి ఆధిపత్యాలిచ్చి, న్యాయమైన పరిష్కారముచేసేందుకు తోడ్పడతారు గనుక ఈ సవరణను ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు అంగీకరించవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను.

“ అంతేకాదు అనంతరములోచూచినా యిది సరియైనదని రుజువువుచున్నది. యిన్ని కేసులలో రెవిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసర్లు మేజిస్ట్రేట్లుగా యిచ్చు తీర్పులను, సెషన్స్ కోర్టులు, హైకోర్టు త్రోసివేస్తున్నవో చూడండి. వారి తీర్పులు యెట్లు పోలీసుల చార్జీలకు అనుకూలంగావున్నవో చూడండి. ఇటీవల కలుసునెరు తాలూకా (చిత్తూరుజిల్లా) కంగంబికుప్పం యెన్నేరులోని బోయనపల్లి ఇనాందారి కేసులో యెట్లు రైతులను సెషన్స్ ట్రిబ్యూనల్ ప్రాసీడింగు కిందకు తెచ్చి వారిపట్ల బాండ్లు వ్రాయించుకొని, అదే సమయంలో ఇనాందారును, అతని యెజెంటును సెషన్స్ ట్రిబ్యూనల్ ప్రాసీడింగు కిందలేకుండా ఆ కేసును నడపిన మదనపల్లి రెవిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసరు చర్యనుచూడండి. ఇనాందారు యెజెంటు రైతులను యెముకలు కరిగేటట్లుకొట్టినా, రైతు స్త్రీలను మానభంగం చేసినా, వారిని వై ప్రాసీడింగు కిందకు యెందుకు తీసుకురాలేదో చూస్తే యెట్టి రెవిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసర్లు యెట్లు భూస్వాముల ఒత్తికి లాలగంతారో తెలుస్తుంది. ఇట్టి రెవిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసర్ల తీర్పులకు రైతులను వదలివెట్టుడంవల్ల కాంగ్రెస్ మంత్రి వర్గం తంజావూరు రైతాంగానికి పన్నయాలకు అన్యాయంచేస్తున్నది అందుకే నేనీ సవరణను ప్రవేశ పెట్టుతున్నాను.

[Sri D. Seetharamiah] [26th November 1952]

“అంతేకాదు మదనపల్లి తాలూకాలో వదుం గ్రామంలో రైతులకు ఖాస్వాములకు 1938 లో కోర్టు సమస్యపై సాగినపోరాటం సమ్మెలసందర్భంలో జిల్లాకలెక్టరు రైతు ప్రతినిధులు, ఖాస్వాముల ప్రతినిధులుకలసి కన్వీనియూట్ బోర్డుగా పనిచేసి పై సమస్యను సులభముగా పరిష్కరించారు. పండితపంతులు రైతులకు, రెండు భాగాలు ఖాస్వాములకు ఒక భాగం ప్రకారం పంచుకోవాలని తీర్పుచెప్పారు.

“అందుకే నేనీ సవరణను ప్రవేశపెట్టాను. ముత్రివర్గం దీనిని ఆంగీకరించాలని కోరుచున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“Sir, after so much discussion for and against this motion, my reply can only be, I oppose the amendment.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“I shall now put the amendments of Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah, Sri V. Sri Krishna and Sri D. Seetharamiah to the vote of the House. The question is—

“After the words “a Revenue Court”, insert the words “consisting of one person on behalf of the Government, one person on behalf of the tenant and one person on behalf of the landowner”.”

The amendment was declared lost.

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—“నేను పోతే తీసుకోవమని కోరుతున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“When an hon. Member wants a division, his request must be seconded. The hon. Member's amendment is lost.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The question is—

“For the words “a Revenue Court . . . Revenue Divisional Officer”, substitute the following words:—

“ad hoc tribunal with the Revenue Divisional Officer as the Chairman and representatives of landowners, tenants and pannaiyals as members”.”

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—“The question is—

“Add at the end the words “The Revenue Court shall consist of equal number of representatives of landlords and tenants or pannaiyals and will be appointed by the disputing parties”.”

The amendment was lost.

Clause 5 was put and carried.

Clause 6.

MR. SPEAKER:—“The hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan has given notice of two amendments. He will please move the amendments.”

* SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—Mr. Speaker Sir, I have got two amendments to clause 6. The first amendment states that the security of tenure to the cultivator should not be for five years, but

26th November 1952] [Sri K. P. Gopalan]

that every cultivating tenant should be given possession of the land permanently. Regarding this I wish to speak a few words. In every radical land reform measure, security of tenure to the cultivator and reduction of rents must find a place.

“Sir, the point which I wish to stress here is this. From the speeches we heard yesterday in the House, it was found that all the Congress members were praising this Bill too much. I want to ask, you, Sir, in a respectful manner whether the Congress members and the Congress Government have forgotten the resolution passed at the Karachi session of the Congress, or at the Faizpur session of the Congress or even the slogan which they put forward before the electorate at the time of the last elections. I wish to point out that both in the resolutions passed at the Karachi and Faizpur Congress sessions and in their election propaganda, the Congress Party said that they would stand for the abolition of landlordism. They said they would give full rights to the tenants over the land. I now want to ask the Congress Government, where are those resolutions and where has their propaganda gone. I am not raising any new point. I am only saying if the Congressmen and the Congress Government have got any respect for the resolutions of the Congress, they must give full rights to the tenants over the land. That is what I have got to say on this point.

4-30
p.m

“The second thing as far as I understand is that in the Tanjore district, evictions have taken place in large numbers. Hundreds and thousands of tenants have been evicted from the land since 1946, 1947 and 1948. According to this Bill, only tenants who have been evicted recently will have the benefit whereas the tenants who were evicted since 1946 to 1948 cannot go to the Conciliation courts to get such benefits. I would therefore request the Government to so modify the Bill that the tenants who were evicted during the period from 1946 to 1948 may also be given the right to go before the Conciliation officers and get back their land. That is the object of my second amendment.

“Now, the next point I wish to place before the House is this. In the speeches made yesterday, one hon. Member referred to a portion in clause 6 according to which the tenant must pay back all the arrears for one year. Suppose I owe a certain amount of money to a person. Have I got a right to appear before a court and file a suit against that man? That is what happens in the case of this Bill. Suppose a tenant has to pay rent to the landlord or the mirasdar. He is forbidden to appear before the court. It is even now existing in our country. Here I want to point out to the Chief Minister and the Government that if this provision is not removed, I will have to take it that this Congress Government exists for collecting the arrears of rent for the mirasdars and the janmis, and surely I will consider this Government as the Government of the janmis, the mirasdars and the zamindars.

“With these remarks I move the three amendments standing in my name.”

The amendments were duly seconded.

[26th November 1952]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, my hon. Friend has moved three amendments . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think, the hon. Member, Mr. Gopalan has given notice of only two amendments. Let him read his amendments."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—"The amendments standing in my name are—

"1. In sub-clause (1) for the words "Every cultivating tenant . . . 1952-53", substitute the following words:—

"Every cultivating tenant who was in possession of any land on the first day of December 1951 shall be entitled to be in possession of such land permanently."

2. In sub-clause (1) for the words "Every cultivating tenant . . . December 1951", substitute the words—

"Every cultivating tenant who was in possession of the land on the first day of December 1947 and was evicted subsequent to that date."

3. In sub-clause (4), omit item (i) '."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The last amendment may be moved when we come to that sub-clause."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—"Then, I am moving only the first two amendments now."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, there are two amendments which Mr. Gopalan has moved. The substance of these two amendments is different. One has the effect of conferring permanent occupancy rights on the tenant. The other amendment relating to the substitution of the words 'Every cultivating tenant who was in possession of the land on the first day of December 1947 and was evicted subsequent to that date' has got a different substance altogether. That means in effect substitute the figure '1947' for '1951'. There are two other amendments which stand in my name which come later on. One of the amendments is to omit the words 'until the expiry of a period of five years'. That also will have the same effect, namely conferring permanent occupancy rights on the tenant. I do not want it later on to be said that this question has already been discussed and disposed of. Therefore, I suggest that these two amendments may be taken up separately and speeches called for on these two separate amendments, so that there may not be confusion later on. As I said, one of the amendments proposes to confer permanent occupancy rights on the tenant and the other deals with the question whether the rights conferred under the present Bill should be conferred even on those tenants who were evicted prior to 1951 or only those who were evicted after 1951. These are entirely two different amendments. I therefore suggest that these amendments may be taken up separately."

26th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"The discussion may take place on the two amendments and when I put them to vote I will put them separately."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"The question whether permanent occupancy rights should be conferred on the tenant or not is a very important question and that must be dealt with separately."

MR. SPEAKER:—"If that is the desire of the House I have no objection."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"In that case, I shall confine myself only to this particular amendment relating to permanency of occupancy rights to the tenant."

"Sir, yesterday, the Hon. Chief Minister developed a very strange theory with reference to this Bill. He developed the theory of husband and wife . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I submit that points should be replied to the same day they are raised."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I am replying to that particular argument that he made out since that particular argument leads to the line of thought which is behind the whole structure of the Bill. That is why it becomes necessary for me to refer to that. I think, Sir, that that line of thought does not lead us anywhere, but it will lead us to a situation which will be very undesirable."

"In the first place, I want to point out that it is that mentality that is behind the whole scope of this Bill. Here is a case where the relationship between the landlord and the tenant is pretty bad for the last so many years. Now, the Bill seeks to make out that they give certain rights to the tenant, and at the end of five years, if either party does not like this kind of relationship he will have the right to break off. That was the line of argument that was developed by the Chief Minister yesterday. I submit that such a kind of mentality itself is class mentality. It shows feudal outlook and the ideology of the feudalism is very rampant there, because the effect of the clause is that at the end of four years the landlord has got a right to give notice to the tenant to go. No ryot can break off his existing relationship. It is the landlord, if he wants to terminate the tenancy at the end of four years and wants to take possession of the land that will have the right to ask the tenant to go and the tenant will not have the right to stay. Therefore, under the existing system of law, under any feudal society, it is only the husband that has got the right of divorce and has got the right of treating his wife in any way he pleases and it is that right that is sought to be imported into this Bill. Here where we are concerned with the relationship between the landlord and tenant, that is, between two human beings, I submit that it is a very dangerous outlook and such an outlook should not govern the conduct of this Bill at all. We have to look at the question from an entirely different angle. Whether the tillers of the soil, those who are engaged in the production of

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[26th November 1952]

food and but for whose toil day in and day out, society will perish, should be allowed to live without the fear of the morrow or whether the Damocles Sword of eviction at the end of five years should be kept hanging over their head is the simple proposition before the House. At the end of five years, the tillers will have no rights whatsoever and they will have to fend for themselves. If we are interested in doing justice to this class of people, people who toil for the society and produce food, we should change our line of thought and adopt a different outlook. Here are landlords who, for the mere fact that they are owners of land, can treat the tenants in any way they please. To say that a tenant cannot be evicted for five years and that he can be evicted at the end of the period is not conferring any right. So long as we do not give the tenant the incentive of permanent tenancy of the land, food production cannot increase. I have seen some countries recently. In spite of the fact that the Hon. Chief Minister may not like those countries, I have seen what has been achieved there. I have seen Warsaw very recently, a city which was devastated house by house by the Nazi Army."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"What is the price of a loaf of bread there?"

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I may inform the Hon. the Chief Minister that there is not a single man who is dying there of starvation, unlike in this country."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"People have been disposed of without starvation!"

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I have also seen countries where people are dying of starvation. In some of the countries which I visited recently, I have seen the joy of creation. The people feel that what they are constructing is for themselves. A whole city which was devastated house by house has been rebuilt within the last five years and beautiful buildings have sprung up. Unless we create the joy production in our peasants, unless we make them feel that what they produce is theirs and that the produce will not be taken away from them, we cannot really enthrone our peasants to produce more food. I want this joy of creation should be created in our people. If this joy is not created, all talk of increasing food production and the Five-Year Plan will not be of any avail and will be a sheer waste. Permanent occupancy right must be conferred on the tenant. He should not be made to feel that at the end of five years, he could not continue on the land which he had been cultivating and that he would be turned out on the streets as a derelict in society. The Directive Principles of State Policy in our Constitution refer to solving the unemployment problem and the provision of security. Why should not this minimum security at least be provided for the tenant? We are not saying to-day that the lands must be taken away from the landlords. If a tenant looks after the cultivation properly, he should not be deprived of his land which is his only means of livelihood and made to starve. If we provide this minimum

26th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

security for the tenant and his family and heirs, then we will be doing something which will make him enthusiastic about food production. Therefore this amendment must be accepted. If it is not accepted, the peasants will feel that the rights that are sought to be conferred on them are fictitious. I commend the amendment for the unanimous acceptance of the House."

* SRI N. VENKATARAMIAH:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Act is called the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Act. But when we consider the provisions of the Act, we see that what is given is not real protection. The tenant is told that he will have to quit his land at the end of five years. Unless we guarantee him permanency of tenure, he will have no enthusiasm to produce from the land as much food as is possible. Further, there will not be happy relations between the landlord and the tenant. I therefore support Mr. Ramamurthi's plea for the acceptance of the amendment."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I have already answered this point during the general discussion. The acceptance of this amendment will entail expropriation of a certain class of people and there will be legal and other difficulties. Therefore I oppose the amendment."

* SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Minister has given no reason to reject my amendment. After hearing the speech of the Hon. Minister, what I feel is that the Government have brought forward this Bill to stem the tide of the strong peasant movement in this State, to stop radical agrarian reforms and to put off abolition of landlordism. I regret that the Government run by the Congress Party, which trumpets so much for agrarian reforms and has passed so many resolutions regarding agrarian reforms, are not accepting this simple amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'In sub-clause (1) for the words "Every cultivating tenant
... 1952-53", substitute the following words:—' 4-50 p.m.

"Every cultivating tenant who was in possession of any land on the first day of December 1951, shall be entitled to be in possession of such land permanently."'"

The amendment was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus—

Ayes.

Sri K. V. Ramesam.
" C. V. Somayajulu.
" K. R. Nallasivam.
" C. Velukkan.
" P. Chinnamma Reddi.
" M. Kalyanasundaram.
" K. P. Gopalan.
" C. Kandaswami.
" S. Ramalingam.
" N. Sivaram.
" A. K. Subbiah.
" K. V. Ramasamy.

Sri T. S. Ardhanari.
" P. Venkatesha Sholagar.
" P. Narasimha Reddi.
" N. Sivarami Reddi.
" D. Seetharamiah.
" C. H. Kanaran.
" K. Madhavan Nambiar.
" R. Krishnan.
" E. T. Kunhan.
" M. Hanumantha Rao.
" C. V. K. Rao.
" K. Rajagopala Rao.

[26th November 1952]

Ayes—cont.

Sri P. Venkatasiviah.
" P. Rama Rao.
" V. Rama Rao.
" T. Potha Raju.
" P. S. Ramachandra Rao.
" M. Narayanaswamy.
" P. Syamasundara Rao.
" G. Satyanarayana.
" G. Anjaneyulu.
" V. Sri Krishna.
" G. Joseph.
" D. Lakshmayya.
" M. Kune Rao.
" G. Nageshwar Rao.
" Alluri Venkataramaraju.
" R. Venkata Jagga Rao.
" K. Ranga Rao.
" K. Subba Reddi.
" Chandra Ramalingayya.
" K. Govinda Rao.
" M. Veerabhadran.
" S. Swayamprakasam.
" V. V. Ramasami.
" Mookiah Thevar.
" E. L. Raghava Mudaliar.
" M. Palaniandi.
" K. Krishna Rao.
" P. Rangaswamy Reddiar.
" T. Shanmugam.
" A. Veloo.
" M. P. Subramaniam.
" Mottaya Kudumban.
" Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah.
" T. Lakshmi Narayana Reddi.
" G. C. Kondayya.
" M. Manickasundaram.
" K. R. Sambandam.

Sri S. Kasi Reddy.
" P. Chokkalingam.
" Saka Venkata Rao.
" T. Nagi Reddi.
" Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.
" S. Deivasigamany.
" Bojja Appalasamy.
" D. Dasarathan.
" S. Vemiah.
" R. Siddanna Gowd.
" K. Ramiah Chowdry.
" S. S. Kolkebail.
" Y. V. Krishna Rao.
" N. Ramabhadra Raju.
" P. Kunhirama Kidav.
" N. Venkatramaiah.
" B. Ramakrishna Reddi.
" K. Ramiah.
" M. Lakshmanaswamy.
" T. Viswanatham.
" P. Ramamurthy.
" P. B. K. Raja Chidambaram.
" T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
" N. Paramasivam.
" V. Gopala Gounder.
" A. Govindasamy Nayagar.
" A. Ayyaru.
" V. Senkaranaarayana Menon.
" K. T. Sridharan.
" M. Narayana Kurup.
" M. Narayana Nambiar.
" O. Koran.
" G. Kunhirama Kurup.
" K. R. Narasa Raju.
" P. K. Gopalakrishnan.
" K. C. Gopalan Unni.

Noes.

The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
" M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
" Dr. U. Krishna Rao.

Sri K. Rajaram.
" B. Bakthavatsalu Naidu.
" C. Rajam Ramaswami.
" P. G. Karunthiruman.
" B. K. Nallasamy.
" S. C. Virupakshayya.
" P. S. Nalla Gounder.
" P. G. Manickam.
" R. Kuppuswami.
" P. K. Thirumurthi.
" V. K. Palaniswami Gounder.
" N. Mounaguruswamy Naidu.
" A. K. Subbaraya Gounder.
" P. S. Rangaswamy Naidu.
" S. R. Arumugam.
" K. H. Bomman.
" Kempai Gounder.
" T. M. Kaliannan.
" M. P. Periaswami.
" Ardhanareswara Gounder.
" A. Sambasivam.

The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nayar.

" Dr. R. Nagan Gouda.

Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.

" T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi.

" K. Koti Reddi.

" A. M. Sambandam.

Sri M. R. Ramachandran.

" O. Venkatasubba Reddi.
" V. K. Ramasamy Mudaliar.
" T. P. Elumalai.
" S. Panchaksharam.
" A. K. Masilamani Chettiar.
" H. M. Jagannatham.
" A. A. Ramachandra Reddiar.
" R. Thangavelu.
" R. A. Nataraaja Mudaliar.
" M. Kandasamy Padayachi.
" L. Anandan.
" V. Krishnaswami Padayachi.
" G. Vagheesam Pillay.
" A. S. Sahajanandam.
" O. S. Nanjappa.
" P. M. Munuswamy Gounder.
" S. Arumugham.
" A. M. Ratnaswami.

Janab Mohamed Salih Maraikayar.

The Hon. Sri V. C. Palanisami Gounder.

" K. Venkataswami Naidu.
" N. Sankara Reddi.
" D. Sanjivayya.
" Shanmuga Rajeswara
Sethupathi (Raja of
Ramanad).
" S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama
Rao.

26th November 1952]

Noes—cont.

Srimathi Dr. Soundaram chandran.	Rama.	Sri V. C. Chudamani Deo.
Sri M. S. Muniswamy Pillay.		„ A. Venkatasubramaniam,
„ V. S. Chinnasami Naidu.		„ P. Gunnayya.
„ S. Chinnakaruppa Thevar.		„ L. Lakshmana Das.
„ V. S. Sivaprakasam.		„ H. Satyanarayana Dora.
„ V. Muthu.		„ M. Rajeswara Rao.
„ A. S. Subbaraj.		„ P. Venkatasubbayya.
„ Thinnakarasami Thevar.		„ K. V. Vema Reddy.
„ R. Krishnaswami Naidu.		„ G. Sivasankara Reddi.
„ S. Jayarama Reddiar.		„ S. Narayanappa.
„ A. Vaikuntam.		„ K. Santhappa.
„ G. Govindan.		„ P. Ranga Reddi.
„ P. S. Krishnasamy Ayyangar.		„ A. Appu.
„ S. Ramasamy Naidu.		„ B. Krishnarurthy Rao.
„ Ar. A. R. M. Chokkalingam Chettiar.		„ K. Varadachari.
„ P. Chellathurai.		„ A. Balarama Reddi.
„ N. Rajagopal.		„ D. Ramabrahmam.
„ R. M. Palanappan.		„ K. Adikesavalu Naidu.
„ A. Ramasamy Thevar.		„ M. Doraikannu.
„ T. V. Sannasi.		„ G. Nagabhushnam.
„ Antony Peter.		„ T. Mallayya.
„ T. R. Varadan.		„ T. Anantha Pai.
„ C. Muthiah Pillai.		„ Y. Manjeyya Shetty.
„ Thiagaraja Pillay.		„ K. Venkatramana Gowda.
„ S. Venkatrama Ayyar.		„ M. Jagannathan.
„ K. Subramania Pillai.		„ E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.
„ P. Urkavalan.		Janab M. S. Mogral.
„ R. S. K. Pandian.		Sri T. Chinnayya.
„ M. G. Shanker.		„ P. Thimma Reddi.
„ Venugopalakrishnaswamy.		„ P. Pundarikakshacharyulu.
„ Chinnathambi Thevar.		„ K. Narayana.
„ P. Selvaraj.		„ N. Venkatayya.
„ V. Arumugam.		„ M. Gangappa.
„ K. Ramasamy Das.		„ L. O. Pais.
„ R. S. Arumugam.		Mr. W. J. Fernandez.
„ A. Rami Reddi.		Sri N. Pentannaidu.
„ N. Chenchurama Naidu.		„ N. C. Ramasamy Kander.
„ P. Gopalakrishna Reddi.		„ Somasundara Gounder.
„ K. Shanmugham.		Janab K. Uppi.
„ P. Venkataswami Reddi.		„ C. Ahmed Kutty.
„ Muthukumarasamy.		„ K. M. Seethi.
„ G. Narayanasamy Naidu.		Sri G. Samia Koorayar.
„ S. R. V. P. Murthy Raju.		„ V. Chidanandam.
„ D. Narayana Raju		„ R. Lakshminarasimha Dora.
Raja Sri V. V. Krishnam Raju Bahadur.		„ K. S. Lakshminipathy Naicker.
Sri Thotta Ramasamy.		„ R. Rangaswami Gounder.
„ P. Satyanarayana Reddi.		„ Raja Sagi Suryanarayana Raju.
		„ A. K. Hanumantharaya Gounder.

Ayes 97, Noes 151.

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ We shall now take up the second amendment of the hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan.” 5.10 p.m.

* SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move the following amendment which stands in my name:—

“ In sub-clause (1), for the words “ Every cultivating tenant December 1951, ” substitute the words “ Every cultivating tenant who was in possession of the land on the first day of December 1947 and was evicted subsequent to that date.” ’

“ Sir, the Hon. the Chief Minister has said that he has brought in this Bill for the benefit of the peasants. In this amendment I am not introducing anything new or anything which could not be

[Sri K. P. Gopalan] [26th November 1952]

conceded by the Government. My amendment only requests that the benefit of the Bill may be extended to those tenants who have been evicted from December 1947 onwards. In the Tanjore district, as far as I understand, hundreds of peasants were evicted by the mirasdars in 1947 and 1948. Therefore, if this amendment is accepted by the Government, it will be beneficial to very many tenants. I request the Government to accept this amendment without any discussion and without raising any controversy."

SRI M. PALANIANDI:—"I second the amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendment moved—

'In sub-clause (1), for the words. "Every cultivating tenant . . . December 1951", substitute the words "Every cultivating tenant who was in possession of the land on the first day of December 1947 and was evicted subsequent to that date."'"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, this amendment is only slightly different from that which has just now been disposed of. Whatever was said against that amendment applies to this also. Therefore, I oppose this amendment."

MR. SPEAKER—"Is the hon. Member withdrawing the amendment?"

SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—"No, Sir."

The amendment was then put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER—"Hon. Members Sri Kune Rao and Sri Pundarikakshacharylu will now move their amendments."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The difference between these amendments and the previous one is only slight. But if they wish to move the amendments, let them do it."

Sri Kune Rao was not in his seat.

SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—"అవస్థ, నా పేరున ఉన్న సరళిను నేను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను."

"My amendment runs as follows:—

'In sub-clause (1) for the expression "first day of December 1951" wherever it occurs, substitute the expression "first day of December 1947."'"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I beg your pardon, Sir. The amendment that was put to vote already and decided upon was Sri Gopalan's amendment. Now, Sri Pundarikakshacharylu's amendment is exactly the same as that."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Then, let him not move the amendment."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"If there is any new reason, he may move it, or else he need not move it."

26th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—“ This amendment is exactly the same as that of the hon. Member Sri Gopalan. The House has given a verdict on that. Therefore, this amendment need not be moved. The hon. Member Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah will now move his amendment.”

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ అభ్యంతే, నా సవరణను ఉపవాదిస్తున్నాను—

‘ In sub-clause (1) for the words “ five years ” substitute the words “ ten years ”. ’ ”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Before taking up the amendment of the hon. Member, the amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member Sri P. Venkateswarlu has to be taken. Is Sri Venkateswarlu moving his amendment? (after a pause) Sri Venkateswarlu is not in his place. So Sri Gopalakrishnaiah may proceed.”

5-20
p.m.

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ కాలు కాలాన్ని ఐదు సంవత్సరాలనుంచి పది సంవత్సరాలవరకు పెంచవలసినదే నా సవరణను ఉపవాదిస్తున్నాను. ఆసలు ఈ బిల్లు తెచ్చిన ముఖ్యోద్దేశ్యము ఏమో దృష్టి లోఉంచుకొని నట్లయితే ప్రభుత్వమువారు నా సవరణను ఆంగీకరించవలసియున్నది. తగినంతకాలం ఒక కాలుదారు క్రింద ఘామి ఉంటుండనే ఘామి ఉన్నట్లయితే అతడు ఘామియొక్క సారాన్ని అభివృద్ధి పరచి ఉత్పత్తిని హెచ్చు చేయుటకు అవకాశం వుంటుంది. అందు వలన ఐదు సంవత్సరముల కాల గడువును 10 సంవత్సరములకు మార్చవలసినదిగా కోరు చున్నాను. ఈ సవరణలో విస్తృతాత్మకమైన దేదీలేదు. మన పొరుగున ఉన్న బొంబాయి రాష్ట్రంలో కాలుదార్లకు కలుగజేసిన సదుపాయాన్నే ఇక్కడి రైతులకు కూడా కలుగజేయుమని కోరుతున్నాను. 1948 వ సంవత్సరంలోను యిట్టి అవకాశముతో బొంబాయి ప్రభుత్వం శాసనంచేసింది. అస్థిర పరిస్థితులలో కాలుదారును ఉంచినందువల్ల అధిక ఆహారోత్పత్తి జరుగదు. సాధారణంగా రైతు పొలంలో మంచి ఎరువు వేసినట్లయితే మొకటి రెండు చూడు సంవత్సరములలో దాని ఫలితము హెచ్చుగా కనుపించదు. ఎరువు వేసే దాని ఫలం అనుభవించటానికి పది సంవత్సరాల వఱకు వుంటేనే కాని లాభంలేదు. అనగా ఏ నాలుగో ఏటో, అయిదో సంవత్సరములోనో పంట వాగుగా పండడం ప్రారంభిస్తుంది. ఈసరికి రైతు ఘామిని వదలుకోవలసిన స్థితిలో ఉంటాడు. తాను ఖర్చు చేసిన డబ్బుకు ప్రతిఫలం రాదని తెలిసిన ఏ రైతుకూడా ఘామిని సారవంతం చేయుటకు ప్రయత్నించదు. కాబట్టి రైతును అస్థిర పరిస్థితులలో ఉంచడం మంచిదికాదు. అంతే కాక ఈనాడు తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో ఉన్న కాలు విధానంకూడా గమనించవలసిఉన్నది. ప్రభుత్వంవారి నివేదికలలో చూపినట్లు 2,112 మంది కాలుదార్లలో—

ఒక సంవత్సరం కాలు	...	...	357	మందికి
రెండు సంవత్సరాల కాలు	...	...	490	”
మూడు	”	...	419	”
నాలుగు	”	...	247	”
అయిదు	”	...	278	”
ఆరు సంవత్సరాలు కాలు	...	...	216	”

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [26th November 1952]

విడు సంవత్సరాలు కొలు ...	...	75 మందికి
ఎనిమిది ,, ...	...	114 ,,
తొమ్మిది ,, ...	...	13 ,,
పది ,, ...	...	293 ,,
పది సంవత్సరాలకుపై	...	405 ,,

“పది సంవత్సరాలకు పై 405 మంది ఉన్నారు. వీరిందరి కొలుకాలం పది సంవత్సరాలకు పెంచినట్లయితే ఒక్క 405 మందికి అనగా మొత్తంలో అయిదవవంతు వారికి మాత్రమే కొంతం ఇబ్బందికలుగవచ్చు. కాని తక్కిన నాలుగు వంతులవారికి వారి వృత్తివిషయమై కొంత స్థిరపరిచి కొలుదార్లకు ఖామితై హక్కు శబ్ద పుడుతుంది. తత్ఫలితంగా అధిక ఆహారోత్పత్తి జరుగుతుంది. ఈ రీతిగానే రాఘవేంద్రరావు రిపోర్టుకూడా ఉన్నది. 1948 ఎ సం॥రం॥ బొంబాయి ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఆచ్యటి కొలుదార్లకు చేసిన మేలును ఈ పథకంకూడా చేయవలసినది ఉద్దేశంతోనే నేను ఈ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించాను. దీని ఉద్దేశ్యాన్ని గుర్తించి, ప్రభుత్వంవారు అంగీకరించవలసిన కోరుచున్నాను.”

SRI M. KUNE RAO:—“అధ్యక్షా, నా పేరు కూనే రావు. శ్రీ గోపాల కృష్ణయ్యగారు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణను నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. నేనుకూడా అట్టి సవరణనే ఇచ్చి ఉన్నాను. కొలుకాలం తగినంతగా ఉండినప్పుడే రైతు ఖామితై కొంత పెట్టుబడి పెడతాడు. సరియైన గట్టి ఎరువు వేసినట్లయితే హక్కు డబ్బు ఖర్చు పెట్టి వలసియిస్తుంది. పాటి మట్టివంటి ఎరువు వేస్తే ఏ నాలుగైదు సంవత్సరములకోగాని ఫలితానికీరాదు. అందుచేత ఖామిలలోపాటి మట్టి పోయాలంటే కొలుకాలం అయిదు సంవత్సరాలకు మించితగ్గదాలి. లేకపోతే ఏ రైతు పాటిమట్టిగాని, లేక గట్టి ఎరువులనుగాని ఖామిలకు వేయరు. తత్ఫలితంగా ఖాసారిం నానాటికీ తగ్గిపోవడమే సంభవిస్తుందికాని అధికం కావడానికి ఎటువంటి అవకాశం ఉండదు. పాటిమట్టి పోసిన ఫలితం 15, 20 సంవత్సరాలవరకు నిలబడిఉంటుంది. అందువల్ల ఖాసారిం తగ్గకుండా చూడాలంటే కొలుకాలపరిమితిని అధమం పది సంవత్సరాలకైనా పెంచవలసిన అవసరం ఎంతైనా ఉన్నదని ప్రభుత్వంవారికి ముఖ్యమైనవిచేస్తున్నాను. వీరో రాత్నాల్లి కంగా కొలుదార్లకు; ఖాన్సాములకు మధ్య ఉన్న తగాదాలను వెనుకకు నెట్టుదామనే అభిప్రాయంతోకాక జాతిసంపదను అభివృద్ధిపరచు ఉద్దేశంతో ఈ సవరణను అంగీకరించవలసినదని మంత్రిగారిని కోరుచున్నాను. శ్రీ గోపాలకృష్ణయ్యగారు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణను హృదయపూర్వకంగా బలపరుస్తున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“Amendment moved—

(i) In sub-clause (1) for the words “five years” substitute the words “ten years”.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting this very reasonable and modest amendment moved by hon. Member Sri Gopalakrishnaiah. In the Select Committee I proposed that a period of at least 15 years should be fixed so that the cultivating tenant may have some security of tenure. I was not able to make the Committee accept my amendment. Just now there was a division on the question of permanency. The House without fully understanding the implications of the amendment

26th November 1952] [Sri T. Viswanathan]

regarding this question did not perhaps like to accept it. I do not think that the vote is against giving security of tenure to the cultivating tenant at all. Though it may be final for the purpose of the Legislature, yet I don't think the mind of the Government and that of the Members of the party in power are permanently made up on this point. I believe the Hon. the Chief Minister, who is as anxious as most of us to give security of tenure to the poor cultivating tenant has not permanently made up his mind on this subject. Of course, it is true that he could not agree to the demand that 15 years' security of tenure should be provided. But, I believe, he realises that 5 years' period is too little. A period of 10 years as suggested by Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah is a very reasonable period. I think the hon. Member has suggested this amendment on the lines of the Bombay Agricultural Landlord and Tenant Act, 1948. So, it is not as if we want to spring a surprise upon the Government. A sister Government in a Sister State has adopted this. Therefore, there is no reason why we, who are anxious to help the cultivating tenant, should fight shy of introducing a period of 10 years as the period of security. Therefore I submit that the Government may be good enough to accept this amendment. If they accept this amendment, people will be satisfied and an atmosphere will be created in which the people of this State will feel, 'Well, whatever may be the party and to whatever political complexion they may belong they are really interested and sincere in giving some protection to the cultivating tenants.' For these reasons, I wholeheartedly endorse the amendment."

* SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI —“అధ్యక్ష, శ్రీ గోపాల కృష్ణయ్యగారు తెచ్చిన సవరణ న్యాయమైనటువంటిది. చలనసాయంతో సంబంధమున్న రైతుగా నేనీ సవరణను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. రైతు రైతకాఘామిని హెచ్చుకాలం సాగుచేసుకొనే హక్కుగలదని తలచినవాడే ఖామిని హెచ్చు శ్రద్ధ చూపుతాడు. ఖామియొక్క సారాన్ని అభివృద్ధిచేయుటకు సాయకర్తగా పనిచేస్తాడు. కాలికాలం తక్కువగా ఉన్నట్లయితే, వికో పండిత పంటలో తన ఛాగాన్ని తీసుకొని సంతృప్తి పడతాడు కాని ఖాసారాన్ని అభివృద్ధిచేయ యత్నించడు. అందువలన నానాటికి ఖాసారము తగ్గిపోవడమే సంబంధించికొని ఖామి చాగుపడడు, పంట వృద్ధి అవడు. ఈ ముఖ్యవిషయాన్ని వృష్టిలో ఉంచుకొని ప్రభుత్వం కొంతగడుపును నిర్ణయించవలసిన అవసరం ఎంతైనా ఉన్నది. ఈ అవసరాన్ని గుర్తించే ఇతర దేశాలలో ఖాసంస్కరణలు చేయబడుతున్నాయి. మనంకూడా అవిధంగానే చేయవలసియున్నది. లేనిచో అధిక ఆహారోత్పత్తి కొనసాగదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ సవరణను అంగీకరించే విషయంలో రాజకీయనిభేదాల పక్షాత్తి లేవద్దని, దేశంయొక్క ఛరోభివృద్ధిని, ఖామిని ఆధారం చేసుకొని జీవించే రైతులొకంయొక్క ప్రగతిని దృష్టి యందుంచుకొని కాసన నిర్మాణంచేయవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. సాగుచేసుకొనే ఖామిని రైతుకు శ్రద్ధ కలగాలన్నా, ఖామిలో హెచ్చు పంటపండాలన్నా శ్రీ గోపాల కృష్ణయ్యగారు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణను అంగీకరించవలసినదని ప్రభుత్వంవారిని కోరుతున్నాను. ఖామిని నమ్ముకొని జీవించేవారిని రక్షించుటే ఈ ప్రభుత్వోద్దేశమైనట్లయితే, అధిక ఆహారోత్పత్తి సాధనే వారి ఆశయమైతే మా కోరికను ప్రభుత్వంవారు

[Sri T. Lakshminarayana Reddi] [26th November 1952]

మన్నించవలసియున్నదని తిరిగి మనవిచేస్తూ ఈ సమరణము జరిపరుస్తున్నాను. రాజకీయ కారణాలను ఈ విషయంలో త్రోసివేయించెనని కూడా ప్రభుత్వంవారిని కోరుచున్నాను."

5-30 P.m. * SRI C. V. K. RAO:—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have also given notice of a similar amendment. Arguments have already been put forth by some hon. Members and the Leader of the Opposition in favour of it. I, therefore, wish the Government accept this modest demand advanced with sweet reasonableness by the Leader of the Opposition."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member is speaking in English."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"He can speak in more than one language. He can also speak in German."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"I am not able to follow the Hon. Speaker."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member is now speaking in English."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"I don't know that. English first comes out."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I know that. I want him to speak in English always."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"I hope the Government will also be so sweet in their attitude and accept this modest demand."

SRI M. LAKSHMANASWAMY:—"ఈ సమరణము నేను జరిపరుస్తున్నాను. ఎంతోకాలంగా కాంగ్రెసువారు భూసామ్య విధానాన్ని రద్దుచేస్తామని, దున్నే రైతుకు భూమిపై హక్కు కలుగజేస్తామని చెబుతూవచ్చారు. కాని రైతుకు కొలుకాలాన్ని కూడా 5 ఏండ్లకు పరిమితంచేశారు. ఇది నిజంగా భూవిధాన సంస్కరణాలేక భూస్వామ్యవిధాన రక్షణ ఆసే సందేహం కలుగుతోంది. గత కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వం కొలు దార్లకు రక్షణకలుగజేసే ఉద్దేశంతో గొన్ని కమిటీలను ఏర్పాటుచేసింది. ఆ కమిటీల వారు స్థితిగతులను విచారణచేసి గొన్ని సూచనలను చేశారు. అదేవిధంగా కాంగ్రెసు సంస్థ నియమించిన కమిటీవారుకూడా గొన్ని సూచనలను చేశారు. ఒక శాసనాన్ని తెచ్చామనే ఈ ప్రభుత్వం ఆ సూచనలు నేటి పాటింపదలచినట్లులేదు. ఎవో నామక పేరుకు ఈ శాసనాన్ని చేయదలచినట్లే కనుపిస్తోంది. ప్రభుత్వంవారు చెప్పేదానికి చేసేదానికి చాలా వ్యత్యాసం కనిపిస్తోంది. ఉదాహరణకు రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు తమ తంజావూరు జిల్లా పర్యటన సందర్భంలో పలికిన పలుకులు ఏమో మనవి చేస్తాను. తంజావూరు మిరాసీదార్ల సుద్దేశించి చెప్పినమాటలివి—

'Production cannot be improved unless you give the tiller of the soil sufficient interest in cultivation. I am not advising you to give away the land to the cultivators. It is to prevent such a calamity that I have brought in this Ordinance.'

26th November 1952] [Sri M. Lakshmanaswamy]

“కాని వారి మాటలకు చేతలకు ఎంతో వ్యత్యాసముంది. క్కాలు కాలాన్ని ఆయి దేండ్లకు మాత్రమే పరిమితం చేయడంవల్ల నిజంగా భూమిని దున్నేవానికి భూమిపై శ్రమ పుంతుందేమో గమనించండి. భూమిని కాగుచేసి దాని ప్రతిఫలం అనుభవించు సమయానికి భూమిని భూస్వామి తినివేసుకుంటాడేమోనని రైతు ఎప్పుడూ భయపడు తూపుండవలసిన స్థితిలో ఉంటాడు. ఇట్టి పరిస్థితిలో భూమి కాగువడుటకు ఎంతమాత్రము అస్కారం ఉండదు. భూస్వాముల రియేణసు మాత్రమే దృష్టిలో ఉంచుకొనక దేశ ఆహార సంచదను అభివృద్ధిపరచుటే ప్రభుత్వం ముఖ్యంగా గమనించవలసియ్యవచ్చు. నిజంగా దేశం కరువుకాటకాలకు గురికాకుండా ఉండాలంటే కనీసం కౌలు కాలాన్ని పది సంవత్సరాలకు పెంచాలని కోరుతున్నాను. లేనిచో ఈ శాసనం చేసిన ఫలితమేమి ఉండదు; ఇదంత నిలవయోగము పొందున మనవి చేస్తూ సమరణసు బలపరుస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the course of the reply to the debate on the previous amendment the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue brought in an argument that though occupancy rights might be given, unfortunately, the Constitution of India came in the way and that would be a sort of expropriatory legislation. While I do not concede that if such a step were taken, it would be expropriatory, granting that it would be, the Hon. Minister took shelter under the Constitution. Now I would submit to him that if that was his difficulty in granting occupancy rights, he can have no difficulty in accepting the ten years tenure. The Constitution will not stand in the way of his accepting it. Instead of providing for five years, certainly the Government can provide for ten years unless they have some other reasons behind them for not conceding to the tenants permanency of tenure. Taking shelter under the Constitution is not going to help them as far as this amendment is concerned. Therefore, I would request the Government not to try to find some other shelter but to face the issue squarely and accept the amendment which is very very reasonable. I would specially request the Hon. the Chief Minister to accept the amendment because he had made it clear while promulgating the Ordinance that unless the tenants were given this much of right there cannot be continuity in food production and food production might suffer. Is it that food production is necessary only for five years and after that the tenant might be evicted from the lands and we need not bother about it and allow the people to suffer starvation, hunger and all that? In the interest of all, if the Constitution does not come in the way, I would request the Hon. the Chief Minister to accept this reasonable amendment and prove that the excuses given by the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue were real excuses.”

* SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI:—“ Sir, I wish just to request the mover of the amendment to withdraw it for this reason. I know the previous amendment asked for permanent occupancy rights being conferred on the tenants. That is a different subject altogether. But I am sure the hon. Member who moved the amendment is aware that the Congress party and the

[Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi] [26th November 1952]

Planning Commission are now engaged on the question of bringing land reforms for the whole country. Their proposals will be coming up before the country very soon. This measure has been taken up only to solve an urgent problem that has arisen in Tanjore district. That is why I feel the tenure has been restricted to a term of five years. I am a landlord myself. I have given my lands on lease to my tenants and I may tell the House my tenants are not changed for generations. The advantage in having a short tenure is, it will make the tenant obtain the optimum results from the land. Anyway since the land reforms under contemplation are to come within a period of five years, it is not necessary that we should increase the term of tenure to ten years at this stage."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" Mr. Speaker. Sir, the references to the advantages of giving an interest to the cultivator are perfectly relevant and sound. But the question is, what we should do immediately. I did say and I stick to my statement that we must give an interest, a greater interest than was previously enjoyed by the cultivating tenant. That is the reason why so many new rights are given them under this Bill. The question is whether we should give immediately a five year or a ten year term of tenure. That is nearer the question before the House, if I had been convinced in my mind that the tenant could take care of the land in the manner in which the tenant could take care of, I would have no difficulty in accepting this modest proposal and all the rest. But I am convinced that the landowners' participation and their full co-operation and even fuller co-operation than they have been giving till now is necessary. If it is necessary for the tenant to have an interest in order to work on the land, it is also necessary for the landowner to have a reasonable quantum of interest if he has to put his co-operation in it. Therefore it will not do to put aside altogether the landowner for ten years on the shelf. He must be there and give his co-operation. The tenant must also be there and they must come together to produce the food we want.

5-40
D.M.

" If hon. Members want a general assurance from me, let them take this implied assurance I am giving, viz., that if during the five years the tenants are not misled but are allowed to work and there is co-operation on both sides, and tenants work in amity with the landowners, if things go on well, I have no doubt as I said on a previous day, that the tenants will get the permanent interest that they desire to have without any right of intervention by the landowner, if I may say so. Therefore I submit, Sir, it would be proper if at this moment the Opposition yields instead of requesting me to yield, and take my implied promise that if tenants are not misled and if things go on well, the tenants are bound to get permanency of tenure during the five years period, if not earlier. They will get the permanency from the people and not from me, for it is not sure that I am going to last for five years more. Somebody in office at that time may bring in

26th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

legislation granting permanency of tenure. The entire population will be impressed by the fact that during the five years the tenants have co-operated well and therefore it would be wise to hand over the land entirely to the tenants, and thereby a permanent interest in the land would accrue to the tenants. Therefore that implied promise of mine is there. Hence I submit that this five-year period is more advisable than the ten-year period for the present. There is no question of principle involved in this fixation of the five-year period. We have started with five years; that is a period during which the tenant and the landlord can work together.

"My friend Mr. Ramamurthi took great pleasure in dissociating himself from the analogy of the husband and wife. I say, Sir, that both are one and indivisible, and what applies to one of the numerous ramifications of human intercourse applies also to another and we need not be ashamed of this comparison. It is necessary for human progress, that we should lead lives of mutual affection, whether it be between the husband and the wife or the landlord and the tenant.

"Therefore, Sir, it would be better if we take the period of five years as it is for the present. If after the expiry of five years the relationship between the landlord and tenant has improved, those in office at that time here either in Government or in the Opposition may find it easier to make further concessions to the tenants in the matter of affording them greater protection. This is my explanation for not accepting what is considered and what is put forward by the Opposition as a reasonable proposition. Such an amendment was not discussed in the Joint Select Committee. None on the other side put forward this proposition then. The talk was there regarding permanency or fifteen years tenure. I am sorry that my friend Mr. Viswanatham did not take that opportunity to put me inside his pocket in the joint Select Committee."

*SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—“అధ్యక్షా, నేను Select Committee లో ఈ యాభై సంవత్సరముల దృక్పథముకలవాళ్ళు లేకపోవడమునకు చాలా విచారకరంగా ఉన్నది. పది సంవత్సరముల అధిపాయముకూడా వచ్చినట్లయితే ఇప్పుడు శాసన సభ్యులకు, నాకు ఉపయోగకరమే. అప్పుడు రాష్ట్రము అంతటా ఉపయోగించుననే అధిపాయము ప్రాజెక్టు పాలాకారిగారు యిచ్చారు. సుబ్బ రెడ్డిగారు మాట్లాడుతూ ప్లానింగు కమిషన్ యిదే విషయము ఆలోచిస్తున్నది అన్నారు. నేను చెప్పేది చట్టముకాదు అనడంలేదు. Bombay Tenancy Act లోను కొండి. దానికిపైనే విమోచనోద్యమం యిప్పుడు ప్లానింగు కమిషన్ ఆలోచిస్తున్నది ఈ 10 సంవత్సరముల విషయమే. కొంతమంది అయిదు సంవత్సరములు తక్కువకాదు ఎక్కువకాదంటున్నారు. అయిదు సంవత్సరములు మేలు అంటూరా! ఆ సంగతి మీకు తెలియదు వారికి తెలియదు. పది సంవత్సరములు బండడము మీరుసంతోషించికాదు మేము సంతోషించికాదు. అందువలన పది సంవత్సరములవరకు నిర్వరణమంటే, అది అయిదు సంవత్సరములయిన తర్వాత కావలసే మరల వెంచుకొనవచ్చుంటారు. కాబట్టి వారు చెప్పేది నిమిషం యిది అధికారరీత్యా అయిదు

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [26th November 1952]

సంవత్సరాల కొలు ఎర్పరుస్తున్నాము అన్నారు. అయిదు సంవత్సరాల గడువుయిస్తే నాలుగు సంవత్సరావరకు ఎరువు వేస్తాడు. అంతవరకు పండించుకున్న దేమో ఖాస్వామికి ఒప్పుబెప్పుతాడు, చివరికి అయిదో సంవత్సరములో ఖామిని ఎరువు వగైరా వేయకుండా అనుభయోగముగా అట్టి పెట్టుతాడు. ఆ గడువుతీరిగానే ఖాఖామందుకు వదులుతాడు. అందువల్ల కొలుదారుని నిరుత్సాహపరచి ఖామిని పాడుజేయడమే సంభవిస్తుందిగాని, కొలుదారు శ్రద్ధ పుచ్చుకొని పంట బాగా పండిస్తాడనే గ్యారంటీ యొక్కడ ఉంది? అందువల్ల నాకు ఖామి అక్కరలేదంటారు. అందువల్ల యీ కొలుపరిమితి అనే విషయము Select Committee లో స్పష్టపడలేదు. ఇక్కడ శాసన సభ్యులను యీ amendment ను support చెయ్యమంటున్నాను. Select Committeeలో యిది ఆమోదించివుంటే బాగుండేది. అందువలన యీ పది సంవత్సరముల పరిమితి కొలుదారు కుచయోగపడుతుంది గనుక యిది అంగీకరించమని రాజిగో చాలాచారిగారిని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Excuse me for interrupting in the middle, Sir. There is one point that has been missed by the people on the other side. The five-year period is so adjusted now on account of the one year notice which we have now provided before the fifth year lapses that the last link of one year is another opportunity, and if the landowner does not give notice well in advance, another entire period of five years security comes to the tenant. Therefore the period of ten years is there without any difficulty if only people do not talk much about it.”

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“కొలుదారీ విధానములో జుగే కొన్ని పద్ధతులు యిబ్బందులు తెలుపుతున్నాను. ఇది నా అనుభవము వల్ల చెప్పగలుగుచున్నాను. ఒక సంవత్సరము గడుపుతుండగానే వోటీసు యివ్వాలంటే ఆ గడువు తప్పించుకొనెందుకు ఆ నేకవిధాలు జరుగుతున్నవి. రిజిస్టరువోటీసు పంపవలసివస్తే, యీ ఖాస్వామి డబ్బుకలవాడైనందున వోటీసుకు వోటీసుమాత్రం సక్రమంగానే తెచ్చి పోస్టుమాస్టరుకు యిస్తాడు. ఆ పోస్టుమాస్టరును జేబులోవేసికొని పోస్టల్ ముద్రమాత్రం వేయించుకొనిపోతాడు. కాని వోటీసు మాత్రము పోదు. అది యీ మధ్యనే పోస్టుమాస్టరు దగ్గరనేవుంటుంది. తీరా కోర్టులోపోయి వోటీసు ఖాస్వామి చూపించుతాడు. కొలుదారుని చూపించమంటే ఆతను నాకు తెలియనే తెలియదు అంటాడు. పోస్టుముద్ర మాత్రం ఉంటుంది. అట్లాగే యీ కొలు దార్లను అనేక విధాలుగా బాధించవచ్చు. ఇంకా ఎక్కువవిధాలు వోటీసు అందించకుండా వోటీసు పంపినట్లు రుజువులు పెట్టుకుంటారు. ఈ విధానము మంచిదికాదని అంటున్నాను.

“సివిల్ కోర్టులో మాకు అనుకూలమగుననే ఉద్దేశముతో ఎదోవిధంగా వీడవాడైన ఈ కొలుదారుమీద హాసపువిద్యలు చేసి, వోటీసు రిటర్న్ అయ్యేటట్లు చేసుకుంటాడనే యీ విధానము మంచిదికాదంటున్నాను. అందువల్ల నేను మనవిచేసేది ఏమిటంటే ఇటువంటి కాలగరిమితి పెట్టి, అయిదు సంవత్సరముల కొకపర్యాయము యీ కొలుదారుని కోర్టుకు యీడవకుండా మరొక అయిదు సంవత్సరముల గడువుకు వెంచి, ఒకే మాటు పది పిండ్ల పరిమితి పెట్టికే కొలుదారు దైర్యంగా కాలక్షేపంచేస్తాడు. ఇదిగాక Grow More Food Scheme కు గూడా గవర్నమెంటు దోహదమివ్వటానికి సావ

26th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

కాశం తుంటుంది. అందువల్ల యీ విషయాల్ని యీ జాగ్రత్తగా పరిశీలించి యీ సమరణ ఆలోచించమని శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారిని కోరుతూ సమరణను బలపరచుచున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
“ Sir, this move on the part of the Opposition looks like a rear-guard action. No doubt there is no constitutional or legal difficulty involved in accepting the amendment; but the difficulty is that this amendment goes against the whole scheme of this Bill. The Bill has been envisaged on the plan of a five-year period. As pointed by the Hon. Chief Minister let us see what good results come out during a couple of years or three years working of this Bill. I think that this five-year period is a reasonable one. I therefore oppose this amendment.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The question is—

‘ In sub-clause (1) for the words “ five years ” substitute the words “ ten years ”.’

“ Before putting this to vote I want to know whether the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is pressing the amendment to a division.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“ I think the proposed period of ten years is a very reasonable request, Sir. I do hope that the Hon. the Chief Minister would agree. If not to-day let him say ‘ yes ’ to-morrow; let the Hon. the Chief Minister give us a promise to that effect, Sir.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ If I were to yield to pressure, I would have accepted this long ago. I am sorry I cannot accept the Hon. Leader of the Opposition’s request.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The question is—

In sub-clause (1) for the words “ five years ” substitute the words “ ten years ”.

The amendment was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus—

Ayes.

Sri P. Thimma Reddi.

„ K. V. Ramesan.
„ P. Pundarikakshacharyulu.
„ K. Narayana.
„ N. Venkatayya.
„ M. Gangappa.
„ M. Pentannaidu.
„ S. Pakkirisami Pillai.
„ P. Chinnama Reddi.
„ K. P. Gopalan.
„ C. Kandaswami.
„ S. Vadivelu.
„ V. Madanagopal.
„ S. Ramalingam.
„ N. Sivaraj.

Sri A. K. Subbiah.

„ K. V. Ramaswamy.
„ P. Venkatesha Sholagar.
„ N. Sivarami Reddi.
„ D. Seetharamiah.
„ E. T. Kunhan.
„ M. Hanumantha Rao.
„ C. V. K. Rao.
„ P. Rama Rao.
„ V. Rama Rao.
„ T. Potharaju.
„ P. S. Ramachandra Rao.
„ B. Lakshminarasa Raju.
„ G. Satyanarayana.
„ S. Swayamprakasam.

[26th November 1952]

Ayes—cont.

Sri V. V. Ramasami.
" G. Anjaneyulu.
" A. Veloo.
" M. P. Subramaniam.
" B. Sankaraya.
" Vavilala Gopalakrishniah.
" T. Lakshmi Narayana Reddi.
" G. C. Kondayya.
" K. R. Sambandam.
" S. Kasireddy.
" M. Lakshmanaswamy.
" S. S. Kolkebail.
" Y. V. Krishna Rao.
" P. Kunhirama Kidav.
" B. Ramakrishna Reddi.
" Pragada Kotaiah.
" T. Viswanatham.
" P. Ramamurthi.

Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar
" K. R. Viswanathan.
" K. C. Gopalan Unni.
" G. Yellamanda Reddi.
" V. Sankaranarayana Menon.
" K. T. Sridharan.
" M. Narayana Kurup.
" M. Narayana Nambiar.
" O. Koran.
" T. Nagi Reddi.
" S. Deivasigamony.
" Bojja Appalasamy.
" S. Veniah.
" R. Siddanna Gowd.
" V. Sri Krishna.
" Chandra Ramalingayya.
" C. Prabhakara Choudary.
" M. Veerabhadram.

Noes.

The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
" M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
" Dr. U. Krishna Rao.

Sri K. Rajaram.
" B. Bakthavatsalu Naidu.
" C. Rajam Ramaswami.
" P. G. Karuthiruman.
" B. K. Nallaawamy.
" S. C. Virupakshayya.
" P. S. Nalla Gounder.
" P. G. Manickam.
" R. Kuppuswami.
" P. K. Thirumurthi.
" V. K. Palanisami Gounder.
" N. Mounaguruswamy Naidu.
" A. K. Subbaraya Gounder.
" P. S. Rangaswamy Naidu.
" S. R. Arumugham.
" K. H. Bomman.
" Kempai Gounder.
" T. M. Kaliannan.
" M. P. Periasami.
" Ardhanareswara Gounder.
" A. Sambasivam.

Dr. P. Varadarajulu Naidu.
The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishna Nayar
" Dr. R. Nagana Gowda.

Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.
" T. N. Venkata Subba Reddi.
" K. Koti Reddi.
" A. M. Sambandam.
" M. R. Ramachandran.
" O. Venkatasubba Reddi.
" B. Parameswaran.
" V. K. Ramasamy Mudaliar.
" T. P. Elumalai.
" S. Panchaksharam.
" A. K. Masilamani Chettiar.
" H. M. Jagannatham.
Janab S. Khadir Sheriff.
Sri A. Ramachandra Reddiar.
" R. Thagavelu.
" R. A. Nataraja Mudaliar.
" M. Kandasami Padayachi.
" V. Krishnaswami Padayachi.
" A. S. Sahajanandam.

Sri P. M. Munuswamy Gownder.
" A. M. Ratnasami.
Janab Mohamed Salih Maraikayar.
The Hon. Sri V. C. Palaniswami Gounder.

" K. Venkataswami Naidu.
" N. Sankara Reddi.
" D. Sanjivayya.
" S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama Rao.

Srima hi (Dr.) T. S. Soundaram Rama chandran.

Sri M. S. Muniswamy Pillay.
" V. S. Chinnaswami Naidu.
" S. Chinna Karuppa Thevar.
" V. S. Sivaprakasam.
" V. Muthu.
" A. S. Subbaraj.
" Thinakaranaswami Thevar.
" R. Krishnasami Naidu.
" Vaikuntam.
" G. Govindan.
" P. S. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar.
" S. Ramasamy Naidu.
" Ar. A. Rm. Chokkalingam Chettiar.
" P. Chellathurai.
" N. Rajagopal.
" R. M. Palaniappan.
" A. Ramasamy Thevar.
" T. K. Rama.
" T. V. Sannasi.
" T. R. Varadan.
" C. Muthiah Pillay.
" Thiagaraja Pillay.
" S. Venkatarama Ayyar.
" L. K. Subramania Pillai.
" P. Urkavalan.
" M. G. Shanker.
" Venugopalakrishnaswamy.
" Chinnrathambi Thevar.
" P. Selvaraj.
" V. Arumugham.
" K. Ramasamy Doss.
" R. S. Arumugham.
" A. Venkatramaiah.
" A. Rami Reddi.
" N. Chenchurama Naidu.

26th November 1952]

Noes—cont.

Sri P. Gopalakrishna Reddi.	Sri D. Ramabrahmam.
„ K. Shanmugham.	„ K. Adikesavalu Naidu.
„ P. Venkatawami Reddi.	„ G. Nagabhushnam.
„ G. Narayanasamy Naidu.	„ T. Mallayya.
„ Raja V. V. Krishnam Raju	„ T. Anantha Pai.
„ Thota Ramasamy.	„ Y. Manjaya Shetty.
„ P. Satyanarayana Reddi.	„ K. Ishwara.
„ V. C. Chudamani Deo.	„ E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.
„ A. Venkatasubramaniam.	
„ P. Gunnayya.	Janab M. S. Mogral.
„ L. Lakshmana Das.	Sri M. Jagannatham.
„ K. Suryanarayana.	„ T. Chinnayya
„ H. Satyanarayana Dora.	Mr. W. J. Fernandez.
„ P. Venkatasubbayya.	Sri L. C. Pais.
„ K. V. Vema Reddi.	„ M. Chadayan.
„ S. Narayanaappa.	Janab C. Ahmed Kutty.
„ K. Santhappa.	„ Kunhi Mohamed Shafiee.
„ A. Appu.	„ K. M. Seethi.
„ B. Krishnamurthy Rao.	Sri G. Samia Koorayar.
„ K. Varadhiachari.	Janab K. Uppi.
„ A. Balarama Reddi.	

Ayes 66, Noes 130.

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Before I adjourn the House, I wish to inform the House that at the request of some Members, we are not going to have a sitting on Friday. Saturday and Sunday will as usual be holidays. Monday being Meeladi Nabi for Muslims is a holiday. So, continuously for four days from Friday to Monday there will be no sitting.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“ Sir, will there be two non-official adys next week.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I am not informed of that.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Sir, on the understanding that the next non-official day which is due on Friday the 28th instant will be substituted by another non-official day on Saturday or some time next week, the above arrangement has been agreed to.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The House will now adjourn to meet again at 10-30 a.m. on Thursday, 27th November 1952.”

The House then adjourned.

VI.—PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

Krishna Anicut Enquiry Committee Report.



6